

# CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

---

VOL. XVI.

MARCH, 1897.

No. 5.

---

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF INFANT SALVATION.

BY PROFESSOR B. B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D.

*(In five parts.)*

### PART I.

THE task which we set before us in this brief paper is not to unravel the tangled skein of the history of opinion as to the salvation of those who die in infancy. We propose to ourselves only the much more circumscribed undertaking of tracing the development of doctrine on this subject. We hope to show that there has been a doctrine as to the salvation of infants, dying such, common to all ages of the Church. And we hope to show that there has taken place with reference to this, as with reference to other doctrines, a progressive correction of crudities in its conception, by which the true meaning and relations of the common teaching have been more and more freed from deforming accretions and its permanent core brought to ever purer expression. As the result of this process, as we hope to show, the Church has found its way to a tolerably complete understanding of the teaching of the Scriptures upon this important subject. Those portions of the Church which have chosen to sit still in the darkness of mediævalism will have advanced, to be sure, but a little way into this fuller and better apprehension. Those portions of the Church which have elected to light their path more or less by the rush-

light of reason, rather than by the sun of revelation, have naturally wandered more or less aside from it. But wherever the Word of God has been the constant study of the Church, the darkness of this problem too has measurably given way before its light; and where the apprehension of scriptural truth in general has become most pure, there the depths of this doctrine too have been most thoroughly sounded and its relations most perfectly perceived.

*The Patristic Doctrine.*

It is fundamental to the very conception of Christianity that it is a remedial scheme. Christ Jesus came to save sinners. The first Christians had no difficulty in understanding and confessing that Christ had come into a world lost in sin to establish a kingdom of righteousness, citizenship in which is the condition of salvation. That infants were admitted into this citizenship they did not question. When the Apologist Aristides, for example, would make known to the heathen how Christians looked upon death, he did not confine himself to saying that "if any righteous person of their number passes away from the world, they rejoice and give thanks to God and follow his body as if he were moving from one place to another," but adds of the infant, for whose birth they (unlike many of the heathen) praised God, "if, again, it chance to die in its infancy, they praise God mightily, as for one who has passed through the world without sins." Nor did those early Christians doubt that the sole gateway into this heavenly citizenship, for infants too, was not the natural birth of the flesh, but the new birth of the Spirit. Communion with God and the inheritance of life had been lost for all alike, and to infants too were restored only in Christ. To Irenæus, for example, it seems appropriate that Christ was born an infant and grew by natural stages into manhood, since, as he

<sup>1</sup> HELEN B. HARRIS, *The Newly Discovered Apology of Aristides*, London, 1891, p. 108.

says, "He came to save all by Himself—all, I say, who by Him are born again unto God, infants and children, and boys and young men, and old men," and accordingly passed through every age that He might sanctify all.<sup>1</sup>

Less pure elements, however, entered inevitably into their thought. The ingrained legalism of both Jewish and heathen conceptions of religion, when brought into the Church, quite obscured for a time the doctrines of grace. It seemed for a season almost as if Christ had died in vain, and as if Paul's whole proclamation of a free salvation had borne no fruit. Men persisted in looking for salvation by the works of the law, and found no ground of trust save in their own virtues. In this atmosphere the problem of the death of little children became an insoluble one. Dying before they had acquired merit, either good or bad, it seemed equally impossible to assign to them reward or punishment. Even a Gregory Nazianzen affirmed that they could be "neither glorified nor punished"—that is, probably, that they went into a middle state similar to that taught by Pelagius. A heretical sect arose, called the Hieracitæ from their master Hierax, who, arguing that if one who strives cannot be crowned unless he strives lawfully it would be absurd to crown one who had not striven at all, consigned apparently all children dying before the use of reason to annihilation.<sup>2</sup> Gregory of Nyssa seems to have some such notion floating before his mind, when, at the opening of his treatise, *On Infants' Early*

<sup>1</sup> IRENEUS, *Haer.*, ii., 22, 4, and iii., 18, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. WALL, *Hist. of Infant Baptism*. Ed. 2, 1707, p. 365.

<sup>3</sup> See EPIPHANIUS, *Haer.*, 67; AUGUST., *Haer.*, 47; and compare SMITH and WACE, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iii., 24. It is possible that this heresy extended itself among the sectaries of the Middle Ages, and that it is some such notion as this that PETER THE VENERABLE intends when he accuses "the heretics" (*i.e.*, PETER DE BRUYS and his friends) of "denying that children who have not reached the age of intelligence can be saved by baptism, or that another person's faith can profit those who cannot use their own, since our Lord says, 'Whosoever shall have believed and shall have been baptized shall be saved.'" Cf. NEWMAN, *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, p. 14.

*Death*, he speaks of such children as passing out of the world before they even become human.

This treatise, which is probably the most extended discussion of the question from this general point of view which has come down to us from the patristic age, is full of interest. It was written in Gregory's old age, at the request of Hierius, the governor of Cappadocia, and undertakes to solve, for the instruction of that official, the problem of justice which the early death of children raised under the legalistic viewpoint. Gregory begins by asserting the incongruity of imagining such an infant as standing before the judgment-seat of God, and the equal injustice of supposing him to pass at once into the lot of the blessed, without having acquired any merit. With apparently entire unconsciousness of the existence of anything like *race-sin*, he frankly proceeds in his argument on the assumption that future blessedness belongs of right to human beings who have not forfeited it by personally sinning, and that the infant, dying such, is therefore entitled to its natural happiness. The point of difficulty arises only from the consideration that then those are unjustly dealt with who are required to grow up in this earthly arena and to earn bliss only with difficulty or to lose it through their transgressions. This he attempts to meet by two suggestions. On the one hand, he suggests that though infants enter at once into happiness, they do not at once enter into all the happiness that rewards him who is victor here. "But the soul that has never felt the taste of virtue," he says, "while it may, indeed, remain perfectly free from the sufferings which flow from wickedness, having never caught the disease of evil at all, does nevertheless in the first instance partake only so far in that life beyond as this nursling can receive; until the time comes that it has thriven on the contemplation of the truly Existent as on a congenial diet, and, becoming capable of receiving more, takes at will more from that abundant supply of the truly Existent which is offered." By this only gradual participation in bliss he would avoid the injustice of placing one that had acquired no virtue on the



same level with him who had borne the heat and burden of the day. On the other hand, he suggests that the reason why God takes some away from the chance of failure here, removing them to certain bliss in their infancy, may be that He owes a debt to their parents' virtue, or that He foresees that the evil to which they would give themselves if left on earth would far exceed that wrought by any actually permitted to remain; or, at all events, he argues, it may be needful to leave some men on earth to sin, that their evil may serve as a foil for the virtue of the righteous, since it is beyond doubt an addition and intensification to the felicity of the good "to have its contrary set against it." We are in little danger of judging Gregory's theodicy successful;<sup>1</sup> but it is doubtless as successful a theodicy as could be wrought out on his premises. If the awards of the future life are to be conceived as distributed strictly according to personal merit, and infants, dying such, are to be esteemed free from sin, it would seem logically unavoidable that we should either suppose them to pass out of existence at death, or, like Pelagius, invent for them a middle place of natural felicity, neither heaven nor hell—or, at the best, like Gregory, less logically but more genially, fancy the Divine Father fitting them gradually for higher things "beyond the veil."

The same ingrained externalism in the conceptions of both Jewish and heathen converts to Christianity wrought, however, in the earliest ages of the Church, more powerfully and permanently another corruption of the Christian idea. The kingdom which Jesus came to found was not of this world, and was not, in its primary idea, an external organization. But it was inevitable that it should soon be identified with the visible Church, and the regeneration which was its door with the baptism by which entrance into the Church was accomplished. Already in Justin and Irenæus the word "regeneration" means "baptism;"

<sup>1</sup> The whole discussion can be conveniently read in vol. v. of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Second series. New York, 1893. pp. 372-381.

and the language of John iii. 5, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," was from a very early period uniformly understood to suspend salvation upon water-baptism. How early this doctrine of the necessity of baptism for salvation became the settled doctrine of the Church it is difficult to trace in the paucity of very early witnesses. Tertullian already defends it from objection.<sup>1</sup> The reply of Cyprian and his fellow-bishops to Fidus on the duty of early baptism, and especially his whole argument to Jubianus against the validity of heretical baptism, plainly presuppose it.<sup>2</sup> By this date clearly it was the accepted Church-doctrine; and although its stringency was mitigated in the case of adults by the admission not only of the baptism of blood, but also of that of intention,<sup>3</sup> the latter mitigation was not allowed in the case of infants. The watchword of the Church—first spoken in these exact words, perhaps, by Cyprian in his strenuous opposition to the validity of heretical baptism—*Extra ecclesiam salus non est*, hardened in this sense into an undisputed maxim. The whole Patristic Church thus came to agree that, martyrs excepted, no infant dying unbaptized could enter the kingdom of heaven.

The fairest exponent of the thought of the age on this subject is Augustine, who was called upon to defend it against the Pelagian contention that infants dying unbaptized, while failing of entrance into the kingdom, yet obtain eternal life. His constancy in this controversy has won for him the unenviable title of *durus infantum pater*—a designation doubly unjust, in that not only did he not originate the obnoxious dogma or teach it in its harshest form, but he was even preparing its destruction by the doctrines of grace, of which he was more truly the father. Augustine ex-

<sup>1</sup> *De Bapt.*, c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Epistles* lviii. (lxiv.) and lxxiii. (lxxii.).

<sup>3</sup> With what limitations may be conveniently read in WALL, *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, ed. 2, 1707, pp. 359 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Epistle* lxxiii. (lxxii.), § 21.

pressed the Church-doctrine moderately, teaching, of course, that infants dying unbaptized would be found on Christ's left hand and be condemned to eternal punishment, but also not forgetting to add that their punishment would be the mildest of all, and indeed that they were to be beaten with so few stripes that he could not say that it would have been better for them not to be born.<sup>1</sup> His zeal in the matter turned on his deepest convictions, and the essence of his argument may be exhibited by putting together two or three sentences from one of his polemic writings against the Pelagians. "We must by no means doubt," he says, "that all men are under sin, which came into the world by one man and has passed through unto all men, and from which nothing frees us but the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ." "For inasmuch as infants are only able to become His sheep by baptism, it must needs come to pass that they perish if they are not baptized, because they will not have that eternal life which He gives to His sheep." "Let then there be no eternal salvation promised to infants out of our own opinion, without Christ's baptism; for none is promised in that Holy Scripture which is to be preferred to all human authority and opinion."<sup>2</sup> The Pelagian, denying original sin, found it an easy matter to assign to infants, born innocent and taken out of life before their own activities could soil their consciences, a place outside of the kingdom of God, indeed, but also free from punishment. The semi-Pelagians, allowing original sin, were in deeper waters, and seem to have tentatively suggested that the fate of each infant was determined by what God knew he would have done had he lived to years of discretion. Augustine, with his profound conviction of the reality of innate sin and of its guilt before God,<sup>3</sup> could not

<sup>1</sup> Augustine's doctrine is most strongly expressed in *Sermo xiv* In *De Peccat. Merit.*, c. 21 (xvi.), and *Contra Julian.*, v., 11, he speaks of the comparative mildness of the punishment.

<sup>2</sup> *De Peccat. Merit.*, c. 33 (xxii.), c. 40 (xxvii.).

<sup>3</sup> Mr. LEA, in his *History of Auricular Confession*, I., 97, adduces a curious instance of the perversity of Monkish thought from St. Opo of Cluny. Augustine bases the condemnability of infants on their

but contend with all his force against these teachings; he was really striving for the essential doctrines of universal sinfulness and of eternal bliss only through the propitiating work of Christ. Because his doctrine was based on such broad grounds no one could surpass him in the strength of his conviction as to the doom of unbaptized children—*i.e.*, in his view, of children unsaved by Christ. But it is not to Augustine, but to Fulgentius († 533),<sup>1</sup> or to Alcimus Avitus († 523),<sup>2</sup> or to Gregory the Great († 604)<sup>3</sup> that we must go for the strongest expression of the woe of unbaptized infants.

Meanwhile, however, whether through the vigor of Augustine's advocacy or out of the natural and indeed inevitable revulsion of the Christian consciousness in the presence of Pelagian error, the Church had come at length to a fully reasoned reassertion of its primitive and essential faith, that infants, too, need salvation, and

original sin, and he sometimes accounts for the transmission of sin by the presence of concupiscence in the act of procreation. Odo, without more ado, traces the condemnability of infants to the sinfulness of conjugal intercourse! Since such infants are certainly not punished for guilt of their own, he argues, it is clear that they are punished for that sin by which they are conceived; "if, therefore," he continues, "the sin in conjugal intercourse is so great that an infant for that alone ought to be punished . . ."

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.*, *De Fide ad Petr.*, c. 27: "It is to be most firmly held, and by no means doubted, that not only men already in the use of reason, but also children, whether they begin to live in their mother's womb and there die, or pass from this world after being born from their mothers without the sacrament of baptism, are to be punished with the everlasting penalty of eternal fire; because although they had no sin of their own committing, they nevertheless incurred by their carnal conception and nativity the damnation of original sin."

<sup>2</sup> *E.g.*, *Ad Fuscina Sororem*:

"Omnibus id vero gravius, si forte lavacri  
Divini expertem tenerum mors invidia natum  
Præpitat, dura generatum sorte Gehennæ.  
Qui mox, ut matris cessavit filius esse,  
Perditionis erit; tristes tunc edita nolunt  
Quæ flammis tantum genuerunt pignora matres."

<sup>3</sup> *E.g.*, *Expos. in Job*, i. 16. Such phrases as these meet us in Gregory's writings: "Those who have done nothing here of themselves, but have not been freed by the sacraments of salvation, enter there into torments;" "It is perpetual torment which those receive who have not sinned of their own proper will at all." (*Moralium*, ix., xii.).

none of any age enters life save through the saving work of Christ. This is the fundamental thought of the patristic age in the matter, to which only a form was given by its belief that saving grace came only through baptism. There were some outside Pelagian circles, like Gregory of Nazianzus, who sought for those who die in infancy unbaptized an intermediate place, neither salvation nor retribution. But probably, with the exception of Gregory of Nyssa, only such anonymous objectors as those whom Tertullian confutes,<sup>1</sup> or such obscure and erratic individuals as Vincentius Victor whom Augustine convicts, in the whole patristic age, doubted that the kingdom of heaven was closed to all infants departing this life without the sacrament of baptism. And now Augustine's scourge had driven out the folly of imaging an eternity of bliss for men outside the kingdom of heaven and apart from the salvation of Christ.

#### *The Mediæval Mitigation.*

If the general consent of a whole age as expressed by its chief writers, including the leading bishops of Rome, and by its synodical decrees, is able to determine a doctrine, certainly the Patristic Church transmitted to the Middle Ages as *de fide* that infants dying unbaptized (with the exception only of those who suffer martyrdom) are not only excluded from heaven, but doomed to hell. Accordingly the mediæval synods so define. The second Council of Lyons and the Council of Florence declare that "the souls of those who pass away in mortal sin or in original sin alone descend immediately to hell, to be punished, however, with unequal penalties." On the maxim that *gradus non mutant speciem* we must adjudge Petavius<sup>2</sup> unanswerable, when he argues that this deliverance determines the punishment of unbaptized infants to be the same in kind (in the same hell) with that of adults in mortal

<sup>1</sup> *De Bapt.*, c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> PETAVIUS, *Dog. Theol.*, ed. Paris, 1865, ii., 59 sq.

sin: "So infants are tormented with unequal tortures of fire, but are tormented nevertheless."

Nevertheless scholastic thought on the subject was characterized by a successful effort to mollify the harshness of the Church-doctrine, under the impulse of the prevalent semi-Pelagian conception of original sin. The whole troupe of schoolmen unite in distinguishing between *pæna damni* and *pæna sensus*, and in assigning to infants dying unbaptized only the former—*i.e.*, the loss of heaven and of the beatific vision, and not the latter—*i.e.*, positive torment. They differ among themselves only as to whether this *pæna damni*, which alone is the lot of infants, is accompanied by a painful sense of the loss (as Lombard held), or is so negative as to involve no pain at all, either external or internal (as Aquinas argued). So complete a victory was won by this mollification that perhaps only a single theologian of eminence can be pointed to who ventured still to teach the doctrine of Augustine and Gregory—Gregory Ariminensis thence called *tortor infantum*; and Hurter reminds us that even he did not dare to teach it definitively, but only submitted it to the judgment of his readers.<sup>1</sup> Dante, whom Andrew Seth not unjustly calls "by far the greatest disciple of Aquinas," has enshrined in his immortal poem the leading conception of his day, when he pictures the "young children innocent, whom Death's sharp teeth have snatched ere yet they were freed from the sin with which our birth is blent," as imprisoned within the brink of hell, "where the first circle girds the abyss of dread," in a place where "there is no sharp agony" but "dark shadows only," and whence "no other plaint rises than that of sighs which from the sorrow without pain arise." The novel doctrine attained papal authority by a decree of Innocent III. (c. 1200), who determined "the penalty of original sin to be the lack of the vision

<sup>1</sup> HURTER, *Theolog. Dogmat. Compend.*, 1878, iii., p. 516: Tract. x., cap. iii., § 729. Wycliffe must be added; but he stands out of the mass.

<sup>2</sup> *Hell*, iv., 23 sq.; *Purgatory*, vii., 25 sq.; *Heaven*, xxxii., 76 sq. (Plumptre's translation).

of God, but the penalty of actual sin to be the torments of eternal hell."

A more timid effort was also made in this period to modify the inherited doctrine by the application to it of a development of the baptism of intention. This tendency first appears in Hincmar of Rheims († 882), who, in a particularly hard case of interdict on a whole diocese, expresses the hope that "the faith and godly desire of the parents and godfathers" of the infants that had thus died unbaptized, "who in sincerity desired baptism for them but obtained it not, may profit them by the gift of Him whose Spirit (which gives regeneration) breathes where it pleases." It is doubtful, however, whether he would have extended this lofty doctrine to any less stringent case.<sup>1</sup> Certainly no similar teaching is met with in the Church, except with reference to the peculiarly hard case of still-born infants of Christian parents. The schoolmen (e.g., Alexander Hales and Thomas Aquinas) admitted a doubt whether God may not have ways of saving such unknown to us. John Gerson, in a sermon before the Council of Constance, presses the inference more boldly.<sup>2</sup> God, he declared, has not so tied the mercy of His salvation to common laws and sacraments, but that without prejudice to His law He can sanctify children not yet born, by the baptism of His grace or the power of the Holy Ghost. Hence, he exhorts expectant parents to pray that if the infant is to die before attaining baptism, the Lord may sanctify it; and who knows, he says, but that the Lord may hear them? He adds, however, that he only intends to suggest that all hope is not taken away; for there is no certainty without a revelation. Gabriel Biel († 1495) followed in Gerson's footsteps,<sup>3</sup> holding it to be accordant with God's mercy to seek out some remedy for such infants. This teaching remained, however, without effect on the Church-dogma, although something similar to it was, among men who served God in the way

<sup>1</sup> Cf. WALL, *op. cit.*, p. 371.

<sup>2</sup> *Sermon, De Nat. Mar. Virg.*, consid. 2, col. 33.

<sup>3</sup> In iv., Sect. iv., q. 11.

then called heresy, foreshadowing an even better to come. John Wycliffe († 1384) had already with like caution expressed his unwillingness to pronounce damned such infants as were intended for baptism by their parents, if they failed to receive that sacrament in fact; though he could not, on the other hand, assert that they were saved.<sup>1</sup> His followers were less cautious, whether in England or Bohemia; and in this, too, they approved themselves heralds of a brighter day.

---

## RECENT DISCOVERIES IN BABYLONIA.

BY A. H. SAYCE.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), January, 1897.

(*In two parts.*)

### PART II.

BUT the empire of Lugal zaggi-si seems to have passed away with his death, and at no long period subsequently a new dynasty arose at Ur. Ur, now Mugayyar, lay on the western bank of the Euphrates, and was therefore more exposed to the attacks of the Semitic Bedâwin than the other cities of Babylonia. It was at the same time brought into closer contact with them in the way of trade, so that while its citizens were necessarily trained to arms they were also exceptionally rich and prosperous. Doubtless these two causes had much to do with the prominent part now taken by Ur in the history of Babylonia. Among the early monuments of Niffer are the inscriptions of a certain Lugal-kigub-nidudu, of whom it is said that "he added lordship to kingdom, establishing Erech as the seat of lordship and Ur as the seat of kingdom." We may gather from this that he had raised Ur to the rank of a royal capital, and had overthrown the last

<sup>1</sup> Cf. WALL, as above.



rulers of Erech. The dynasty of Erech had thus been supplanted by that of Ur.

According to Professor Hilprecht, this would have been about 4000 B.C. How long the first dynasty of Ur lasted we cannot tell. It had to keep up a perpetual warfare with the Semitic tribes of northern Arabia, Ki-sarra, "the land of the hordes," as it was termed by the Sumerians. Meanwhile a new state was growing up on the eastern side of the Euphrates in a small provincial city called Lagas, whose ruins are now known as Telloh. Its proximity to Eridu, the seaport and trading depot of early Babylonia, had doubtless much to do with its rise to power. At all events the kings of Telloh, whose monuments have been brought to light by M. de Sarzec, became continually stronger, and the dynasty of Lagas took the place of the dynasty of Ur. One of these kings, E-Anna-gin, at length defeated the Semitic oppressors of northern Chaldæa in a decisive battle and overthrew the "people of the Land of the Bow." A stele was set up in commemoration of the event, now known to Assyriologists as "the Stele of the Vultures." On it are depicted the chief incidents of the war. The corpses of the enemy lie on the field of battle, and a flock of vultures hovers above them ready to devour the slain. In another compartment we see the captives, some of whom are about to be offered up in sacrifice to the gods of the victors. For awhile the Semites, who had been pressing upon Babylonia from the north, were driven back, and the Sumerians were once more supreme.

Heuzey, Hommel, and myself independently arrived at the conclusion that the dynasty of Telloh was earlier than the age of Sargon of Akkad, and in my Hibbert Lectures I have assumed that such was the case. Some of the younger Assyriologists, however, have disputed the conclusion, and with more scepticism than knowledge have questioned the antiquity of the older monuments of Telloh. Professor Hilprecht has now shown that palæography demands the date which we have assigned to them, and even while I write a

discovery has been made which sets the question at rest. Seals have been found bearing the name of the high-priest, Lugal-Usumgal, who lived long after the kingdom of Lagas had passed away, and informing us that he owned allegiance to Sargon of Akkad. The kings of Lagas and their monuments must accordingly go back to about 4000 B.C.

The kings of Lagas represent the closing days of Sumerian supremacy. With Sargon and his empire the Semitic age begins. The culture of Chaldæa is still Sumerian, the educated classes are for the most part of Sumerian origin, and the literature of the country is Sumerian also. But the king and his court are Semites, and the older culture which they borrow and adopt becomes Semitised in the process. For the first time the cuneiform characters are adapted to express Semitic sounds and words, texts are drawn up in Semitic Babylonian or in a Sumerian which has been translated from a Semitic original. The result of this process is a mixed language, not unlike our own English. Just as the official religion of Babylonia from the days of Sargon onward was a combination of Sumerian and Semitic elements, so too the official language of Babylonia was one in which a large portion of the vocabulary was of Sumerian origin, and even the grammar and structure were profoundly influenced by Sumerian modes of speech. The mixed culture of Babylonia was reflected in the mixed language which was used there.

But the process of amalgamation lasted long. For many generations Sumerians and Semites lived side by side, each borrowing from the other, and mutually adapting and modifying their own forms of expression. Semitic idioms and words made their way into Sumerian texts, while the language of the Semitic scribes became filled with borrowed words and phrases. Naturally, however, it was the Semitic conqueror of Babylonia whose language underwent the greatest alteration. When he first arrived in Babylonia he was still an uncultured nomad; the culture was wholly Sumerian, and with the adoption of the culture neces-

sarily went the adoption, to a certain extent, of the language which belonged to that culture. The system of writing with which the culture was indissolubly connected was itself inseparable from the language of which it had originally been the pictorial expression. Moreover, the literature of the country was in Sumerian. Sumerian was the language of the law, of diplomacy, of religion, in short, of all the departments of the State. Even the rulers of the "Land of the Bow," in adopting the writing of Babylonia, had been obliged to adopt the agglutinative language of Babylonia as well.

It was only very gradually that literature ventured to substitute the language of the Semitic intruder for the older language of the country. The movement seems to have begun under Sargon of Akkad. The great work on astronomy, which was compiled for the library he established in his capital, was written in what we must henceforth term Semitic Babylonian. Translations of Sumerian books were made into Semitic, and grammars and dictionaries and phrase-books were compiled to facilitate the acquisition of the two languages. Misled by the numerous cases in which a Semitic word used at Court was really of Sumerian derivation, the scribes began to devise Sumerian etymologies for names and words which were of genuine Semitic origin. Sumerian etymologies alone were held to be respectable, since Sumerian was the language of culture and literature, and the scribes accordingly acted like the etymologists of two centuries ago, who endeavored to connect all English words, whatever might be their source, with Latin or Greek roots.

Sumerian continued to be the language of religion and law—the two most conservative branches of human study—down to the age of Abraham. The cause of this was partly political. The empire of Sargon did not mean the final and definite triumph of the Semitic element. More than once after its fall Babylonia again passed under the rule of a Sumerian dynasty, and the Sumerian language and population continued to predominate in the southern half of the country down to

a very late date. Fragments of cuneiform dictionaries, found by Professor Petrie at Tel-el-Amarna, go to show that Sumerian was still spoken in southern Babylonia in the fifteenth century B.C. It died hard, like the Keltic languages in Great Britain.

But Semitic Babylonian was not a mixed language merely because it was the result of an amalgamation of Sumerian and Semitic elements. Like English, it offered hospitality to words from all parts of the known world. The recent discoveries have shown why this must necessarily have been the case. For unnumbered ages Babylonia had been the centre of culture for the whole of Western Asia, and at times it had been the political centre of Western Asia as well. As we have seen, the empire of Lugal-zaggi-si comprised Mesopotamia and Syria, and extended to the Mediterranean Sea, while that of Sargon and his son Naram-Sin reached from the mountains of Elam to the frontiers of Egypt. It was not only Semitic Babylonian, therefore—or Assyrian, as we are accustomed to call it—which was in contact with the Sumerian language of literature and culture; the other Semitic dialects of Western Asia were in contact with it too. And when Semitic Babylonian, with its mixed vocabulary and idioms, began to take the place of the older Sumerian, the influence exercised by the literary speech of Babylonia upon these Semitic dialects became greater than before. The influence, moreover, was not one-sided. We have learnt from the contract tablets that colonies of Canaanitish and Syrian merchants were settled in Chaldæa, where land was allotted to them, and they enjoyed rights and privileges which allowed them to become Babylonian officials, to act as witnesses in Babylonian courts, and to bring their disputes with native Babylonians before special judges of their own. From a remote period, consequently, all the Semitic dialects of Western Asia from the Euphrates and Tigris to the Mediterranean had passed under the influence of the ancient agglutinative language of Chaldæa.

The discovery will necessarily revolutionise the cur-

rent conceptions of Semitic speech. We can no longer be certain that idioms hitherto supposed to be specifically Semitic were not really once borrowed from Sumerian, or that words which have been pronounced to be of genuinely Semitic origin are not Semitised forms of Sumerian derivation. An explanation is at last afforded us of the fact that the Semitic word for "city" (*'ir*) which has been borrowed from the Sumerian *eri* or *uru*, is found in Canaanite and Hebrew, not in Assyrian. The borrowing must go back to the days when the Semitic languages of the West were in contact with the dominant Sumerian, and when the Semitic nomad became acquainted for the first time with the walled and civilised city.

The new facts that have been disinterred from the grave of the past furnish a striking confirmation of Professor Hommel's theory, which connects the culture of primitive Egypt with that of primitive Chaldaea, and derives the language of the Egyptians, at all events in part, from a mixed Babylonian language in which Semitic and Sumerian elements alike claimed a share. We now know that such a mixed language did once exist, and we also know that this language and the written characters by which it was expressed were brought to the shores of the Mediterranean and the frontiers of Egypt in the earliest age of Egyptian history. It must have been at this time that the seal-cylinder—that characteristic product of Babylonian industry—made its way to the Nile. It is a mark and token of the Old Egyptian Empire. After the fall of the Sixth Dynasty it disappears, and, though revived for a time under the kings of the Twelfth Dynasty, it then assumed a new and non-Babylonian shape. But the cylinders of the Old Empire are purely Babylonian in form: one in the Gizeh Museum which bears the name of Men-kau-Ra, or Mykerinos of the Fourth Dynasty, cannot be distinguished from Babylonian seal cylinders of the same age, except by its hieroglyphics, and another which I obtained last winter from Elephantine would be pronounced Babylonian were it not for the Egyptian characters upon it.

Now the Babylonian seal-cylinder was known to the Egyptians in the very earliest days of their history, long before the epoch of the Fourth Dynasty, it may be of Menes himself, the founder of the Egyptian monarchy. One of the hieroglyphs used to denote a high officer of state represents a stone cylinder with a string attached to it, as Professor Petrie's researches at Mèdûm have made clear. The cylinder is of exactly the same shape as those of Babylonia, where, as we learn from Herodotus, the string was employed to fasten the seal to the wrist. It is impossible that two peoples should have independently lighted upon so peculiar and intricate an invention. In Egypt, moreover, there was no necessity for the use of a seal-cylinder at all, and it was on this account that with the fall of the Old Empire it went out of fashion. In Babylonia, on the contrary, nature itself seemed to force the invention upon the people. Babylonia was an alluvial plain where stone did not exist. Every small pebble, therefore, was precious, while the natural writing material was clay. Hence it was that Babylonia was the mother-land of seal-cutting; and hence it was also that the easiest way of signing a document was by rolling an engraved cylinder over the soft clay.

There was, then, intercourse between Babylonia and Egypt at the very dawn of history, and the inscription of Lugal-zaggi-si seems to leave no doubt that this intercourse was, in the first instance, carried on by land. When the first ships made their way along the coast of Arabia to the harbours of Egypt we do not know, but it too must have been in a far-off age. Such, at least, is the conclusion to which we are led by the legends of Eridu, once the seaport of prehistoric Chaldaea, though its site is now far removed from the ever-retreating waters of the Persian Gulf.

The intercourse lasted into later ages. Naram-Sin, the successor of Sargon of Akkad, carried his arms to Magan, the name by which Midian and the Sinaitic peninsula were known to the Babylonians, and there contended with Egypt for the possession of the pre-

cious mines of copper and malachite. Several centuries later we find the Babylonian princes still keeping up their relations with the distant West. When a second dynasty arose at Ur (B.C. 2700), whose kings made themselves supreme throughout Babylonia, their vassal Gudea, the high-priest of Lagas, imported materials for his temples and palaces from all parts of the known world. Hewn stones were brought from "the land of the Amorites," as Syria and Palestine were named, alabaster from the Lebanon, cedar beams from the forests of the Amanus, blocks of hard stone from Samalun, north of the Gulf of Antioch, gold-dust and acacia-wood from the great "salt" desert which lay between Egypt and Canaan, and diorite from the quarries of the Sinaitic peninsula. Out of this diorite Chaldean sculptors carved the seated figures which are now in the Louvre, and which remind us so forcibly of Egyptian art in the age of the Old Empire. It was not the first time, however, that the artists of Lagas had sent to Magan for the hard and intractable stone out of which they essayed to carve the lineaments of the human form. Long before the age of Gudea, before even that of Sargon of Akkad, when Lagas was the capital of an independent principality, one of its kings, Ur-Nina by name, had dedicated to his god two statues of stone which had been brought from the Sinaitic peninsula. Gudea did but carry on the traditions of the past.

The library of 33,000 tablets discovered by M. de Sarzec at Telloh, of which I have already spoken, belongs to the age of Gudea. Like the 32,000 tablets and fragments carried away by the American Expedition from the ruins of the library of Nippur, the collection contains—to quote the words of Professor Hilprecht—"syllabaries, letters, chronological lists, historical fragments, astronomical and religious texts, building inscriptions, votive tablets, inventories, tax-lists, plans of estates, contracts," etc. When to these collections we add the contents of other libraries of the same date, disinterred for the Turkish Government, under the direction of Dr. Scheil, at Abu-Habba,

or Sippara, at Jokha, or Isin, at Warka, or Erech, and elsewhere, it will be seen that the Assyriologists have plenty of work in store for them, and that even the historical revelations of to-day are likely to be surpassed in interest and importance by those of to-morrow. It is true that the larger number of tablets hitherto found are contracts relating to the lease and sale of property or the trading transactions of the ancient world, but it is also true that it is just these contemporaneous records of a past civilisation which throw most light on the social life of early Babylonia and its commercial relations with the rest of the civilised East, while the value to the historian of the dates attached to them cannot be over-estimated.

Thanks to the tablets already examined—a fraction though they be of the whole number now in our hands—the history of Babylonia from the period of Gudea onwards is every day becoming clearer and more distinct. We already know as much about the inner life of the Babylonians in the age of Abraham as we do about the inner life of the Greeks in the age of Themistokles. And with this increase of our knowledge has come a widening of our conceptions as to the character and extent of ancient Babylonian culture. It was a culture that had spread throughout the whole of Western Asia, and, in the course of centuries, had taken deep root therein. Along with the culture and writing of Chaldæa had gone the language and religion of the Babylonians. The recollection of the empires of Lugal-zaggi-si and Sargon of Akkad never faded away; up to the era of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt, when conquest had handed over to the Pharaohs the political power in Western Asia once possessed by the Babylonian kings, the sovereigns of Babylonia never forgot their ancient claims to rule in Syria and Palestine. Whenever a dynasty arose strong enough to bind Babylonia into a united monarchy, it carried its arms to the shores of the Mediterranean and restored the political supremacy of Babylonia in the distant “land of the Amorites.” The second dynasty of Ur, under which Gudea lived, was followed by a third



dynasty, and numberless contracts exist dated in the reigns of its kings. One of the latter, Inè-Sin by name, for two successive years carried on war against the Phœnician city of Simyra (the Zemar of Gen. x. 18), while his daughter received the fief of Markhasi, now Mer'ash, in Northern Syria. His grandson, Gimil-Sin, signalised the first year of his reign by over-running the land of Zabsali in the Lebanon.

The third dynasty of Ur had to make way for what the native chronologists called the first dynasty of Babylon. But this dynasty was not of Babylonian origin. The names borne by the kings show that they must have come from Southern Arabia, and spoken a language more closely allied to Hebrew than to Semitic Babylonian. They were Semites indeed; but the native compilers of the philological tablets regarded them as foreigners. Their rise was contemporaneous with other troubles in Babylonia. The country fell under Elamite dominion, and a rival kingdom to that of Babylon was established in the south, with its capital at Larsa, under an Elamite prince. But Canaan and Syria still obeyed the new lords of Chaldæa. Eri-Aku or Arioch, the king of Larsa, calls his father, though at home merely a subordinate Elamite prince, "the father of the land of the Amorites."

It was Khammurabi or Ammi-rabi, the Amraphel of Genesis, who finally put an end to this period of disunion and subjection. He rebelled against his Elamite suzerain and attacked his rival at Larsa. The history of the war has now been cleared up for us, partly by some fragmentary tablets recently discovered by Mr. Pinches, partly by letters of Khammurabi himself, which have just been found by Dr. Scheil in the collections at Constantinople. Eri-Aku or Arioch had been supported by Kudur-Laghghamar, the king of Elam, and with Elamite help had driven Sin-idinnam, the former king of Larsa, out of southern Babylonia. Sin-idinnam fled to the court of the king of Babylon, and there awaited his opportunity. At last Khammurabi felt himself strong enough to proclaim his independence of Elamite authority. At first, however, the

tide of war turned against him. Kudur-Laghghamar, the Chedor-laomer of Genesis, summoned to his help the Umman Manda or nomad "nations" of Kurdistan, whose chief apparently was Tudghula, the Tid'al of Genesis, and with their aid he captured Babylon and desecrated its sanctuary of Bel-Merodach. But the gods came to the assistance of Khammurabi, and in the end he was successful. The yoke of the Elamite was shaken off, Larsa was restored to its former lord, and Khammurabi ruled over an independent and united Babylonia. One of his letters refers to the statues and other presents which he bestowed upon Sin-idinnam "as a recompense for his valour on the day of Kudur-Laghghamar's defeat."

But the ruler of united Babylonia was ruler also of Western Asia. Khammurabi once more assumes the title of "king of the land of the Amorites," or Syria and Palestine, and his great-grandson, Ammisatana, calls himself "king of Babylon, of Kis (or Mesopotamia), of Sumer and Akkad (or Babylonia), and of the land of the Amorites." From henceforth Babylon is the acknowledged head of Western Asia, and when its political power waned with the rise of that of Egypt its religious and literary influence still remained undiminished. It was not till the days of Darius and Xerxes, the Zoroastrian unbelievers, that the old *prestige* finally passed away from the city of Bel-Merodach, and it ceased to be the sacred city of the Oriental world, the Rome of the ancient East, which alone could give a legitimate title to the reviver of the empire of Lugal-zaggi-si.

## THE BASIS OF MORALS.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE G. FINDLAY, B.A.

From *The Expository Times* (Edinburgh), February, 1897.

## PART II.

WE come at length in our analysis of the moral nature to the word *conscience*, which marks the central point of our rational activity, as duty supplies its discursive sphere. For three centuries our language has had a double term for *conscience* and *consciousness* (like the German *Gewissen* and *Bewusstsein*), which are both contained in the Old English *inwit*, as in the Latin *scientia*, the French *conscience*, and the Greek *syneidesis* of the New Testament. Now, this modern English discrimination is an interesting etymological fact, and an aid to clear expression. But the oneness of the two ideas in other principal languages is also significant. It indicates that conscience is not a separate faculty superinduced upon our consciousness; it is the organic function of consciousness. Conscience is, as Kant called it, 'practical reason,' reason applied to conduct. We cannot think of our conduct at all, nor of the activity of other persons, without thinking of it in terms of conscience, as dutiful or undutiful, right or wrong. The earliest movements of the child's intelligence show this as clearly as the experience of the mature man. The consciousness of the bad man witnesses to the fact no less than that of the good. As self-knowing, self-directing creatures, rational and free, we are bound to have a conscience; as a society of such creatures, we are still more bound to have some sort of conscience. Human life has never been discovered anywhere, it is in fact inconceivable, without an inner sensibility of this sort, without some initial aptitude for the recognition of moral order. Beings like ourselves, in a world like this, compounded of soul and sense, wrought upon by wild, struggling forces within and without, require for tolerable existence some ideal scheme of life, some law lodged in the understanding

and informing the will. Otherwise we are lost at the outset, and bound for shipwreck as certainly as any vessel sailing into wintry seas without chart or compass, rudder or pilot. Morality is the chart, drafted by religion; rectitude is the compass; duty, the rudder; and conscience, the steersman at the helm. Only, in this case, pilot and rudder are not things separate from the vessel; it is the soul, the ship of life herself, thrilling with intelligence and purpose in every part, that bends her powers to the direction of her course, and wins her perilous way through reefs and quicksands, and against buffeting storm and treacherous current, till she reaches the far haven where she would be.

This is, substantially, the argument of Bishop Butler in the famous 'Three Sermons upon Human Nature.' Butler argues the necessity and supremacy of conscience from the mixed constitution of the soul and the combination in it of higher and lower faculties, with their various and conflicting aims, which make the control of a superior internal principle indispensable. Butler's reasoning is as valid now as it was a century and a half ago. Evolution and psychological research have detracted nothing from its real force. Education, in the individual or the race, does not generate conscience; it is there to begin with, the fulcrum of education. Without conscience in the child or the savage, there is nothing to educate. Education elicits and trains our powers; it never originates. You cannot 'make a silk purse out of a sow's ear,'—nor a moral out of a non-moral being, by any deftness of manufacture. Social development does not in the least account for the individual conscience: it presupposes it. The conscience of society is nothing more than the aggregate, or average, of the consciences of its constituents; and the causes of the advance or retrogression of society have their spring in the spirit of individual men. Unless the reason of man were fundamentally moral, as it is fundamentally mathematical, unless there were what the theologians call an 'original righteousness' proper to our nature, the developed life of civilised society were impossible, as

impossible as a plant without root and seed, as running without feet, as arithmetic without the certainty that two and two make four.

It is true that experience justifies moral wisdom ; and we are, on the whole, greatly the gainers in material utility by the practice of virtue. But virtue must be practised for conscience' sake before the gain appears ; and experience too plainly shows that no experience of the advantages of virtue will sustain it against the sophistries of passion, when higher motives fail. You will never make children good by teaching them that it pays, and without awakening in their souls the pure love of goodness.

The very consciousness of self, we contend, carries with it some conscience of right and duty. If it were not so, if goodness did not in some sort commend itself to every man, and command his respect because he is a man, our race would have destroyed itself long before this in selfish passion. Man's intellectual progress, if imaginable at all upon non-moral terms, would have been that only of an infernally clever brute. Conscience is the pivot of our existence as reasoning and self-directing and related beings. It is the focus of personal life, the generating centre of character. As science has for its realm the ordered world subject to our intelligence, so conscience rules the world of voluntary action. The scientific man strives to comprehend his world as it is, the conscientious man strives to fashion it as it ought to be. With the former we may, with the latter we must, participate.

We cannot pass from the topic of conscience without remarking on the specific character of the emotions that attend its exercise. The intensity and ardour of these sensibilities in the healthy mind, the singular delicacy, variety, and complexity of which they are susceptible, their long continuance and power to colour and temper our whole experience, the way in which they break out from unsuspected depths, and in their painful forms of remorse or indignation will sometimes by a sudden upheaval rend the entire fabric of a man's previous life, or change the current of a nation's history—this incomparable vividness and electric force of

and informing the will. Otherwise we are lost at the outset, and bound for shipwreck as certainly as any vessel sailing into wintry seas without chart or compass, rudder or pilot. Morality is the chart, drafted by religion; rectitude is the compass; duty, the rudder; and conscience, the steersman at the helm. Only, in this case, pilot and rudder are not things separate from the vessel; it is the soul, the ship of life herself, thrilling with intelligence and purpose in every part, that bends her powers to the direction of her course, and wins her perilous way through reefs and quicksands, and against buffeting storm and treacherous current, till she reaches the far haven where she would be.

This is, substantially, the argument of Bishop Butler in the famous 'Three Sermons upon Human Nature.' Butler argues the necessity and supremacy of conscience from the mixed constitution of the soul and the combination in it of higher and lower faculties, with their various and conflicting aims, which make the control of a superior internal principle indispensable. Butler's reasoning is as valid now as it was a century and a half ago. Evolution and psychological research have detracted nothing from its real force. Education, in the individual or the race, does not generate conscience; it is there to begin with, the fulcrum of education. Without conscience in the child or the savage, there is nothing to educate. Education elicits and trains our powers; it never originates. You cannot 'make a silk purse out of a sow's ear,'—nor a moral out of a non-moral being, by any dexterity of manufacture. Social development does not in the least account for the individual conscience: it presupposes it. The conscience of society is nothing more than the aggregate, or average, of the consciences of its constituents; and the causes of the advance or retrogression of society have their spring in the spirit of individual men. Unless the reason of man were fundamentally moral, as it is fundamentally mathematical, unless there were what the theologians call an 'original righteousness' proper to our nature, the developed life of civilised society were impossible, as

impossible as a plant without root and seed, as running without feet, as arithmetic without the certainty that two and two make four.

It is true that experience justifies moral wisdom ; and we are, on the whole, greatly the gainers in material utility by the practice of virtue. But virtue must be practised for conscience' sake before the gain appears ; and experience too plainly shows that no experience of the advantages of virtue will sustain it against the sophistries of passion, when higher motives fail. You will never make children good by teaching them that it pays, and without awakening in their souls the pure love of goodness.

The very consciousness of self, we contend, carries with it some conscience of right and duty. If it were not so, if goodness did not in some sort commend itself to every man, and command his respect because he is a man, our race would have destroyed itself long before this in selfish passion. Man's intellectual progress, if imaginable at all upon non-moral terms, would have been that only of an infernally clever brute. Conscience is the pivot of our existence as reasoning and self-directing and related beings. It is the focus of personal life, the generating centre of character. As science has for its realm the ordered world subject to our intelligence, so conscience rules the world of voluntary action. The scientific man strives to comprehend his world as it is, the conscientious man strives to fashion it as it ought to be. With the former we may, with the latter we must, participate.

We cannot pass from the topic of conscience without remarking on the specific character of the emotions that attend its exercise. The intensity and ardour of these sensibilities in the healthy mind, the singular delicacy, variety, and complexity of which they are susceptible, their long continuance and power to colour and temper our whole experience, the way in which they break out from unsuspected depths, and in their painful forms of remorse or indignation will sometimes by a sudden upheaval rend the entire fabric of a man's previous life, or change the current of a nation's history—this incomparable vividness and electric force of

the moral feelings proves that the conscience, whose servants they are, is the sovereign factor of personality. These thunders and lightnings of the soul are wielded by that power which sits on the throne of our being.

Another step, and we are at the end of our course of self-examination. We have seen that there belongs to us as persons a *goodness*, a *moral* excellence, which cannot be resolved into lower elements or referred to any material source; that *virtue* is the quality of the man himself (the *vir*), of the self in the man. The various forms of goodness we conceive under the form of *right*, as they are reduced to general rules for conduct and so prescribed. These rules, endorsed by our own minds and brought to bear upon daily action, define our *duties*, which we are free to discharge or neglect, and which involve us in a far-spreading web of obligation and responsibility, and constitute the moral world reaching indefinitely beyond us. It is in the sphere of duty, and as beings capable of moral goodness, that we become properly aware of ourselves; and consciousness wakes up in us each in the form of *conscience*. Our reason, in its rudiments, is a moral and not a mere intellectual discernment; it instinctively judges, and through the will guides conduct, and it has its principles, explicit or implicit, to go by in so doing. And the emotions that our moral judgments excite in us are the most powerful and ardent known to the soul.

So far we have advanced, with some degree of unanimity. Our goal is the point from which Aristotle sets out in the first paragraph of his immortal Ethics. 'Every art,' he says, 'and every science, and similarly every moral act and decision of the will, has some *good* at which it aims. . . . The material crafts and professional arts have their several ends. But there is surely some master art and higher end to which these are subordinate. There is *the art of life itself*, the final end of human pursuits. And this end we call the chiefest good, the perfect consummation of human aims.' Thus far Aristotle.

Reason is prospective, no less than retrospective.



It assumes a purpose, as well as a cause, for the objects of its knowledge. To bid it, because of its past mistakes, renounce the search for ends and be content with causes, as the Positivists do, is to require the human reason to mutilate itself. The *end* is alone the true reason of things. Plan and purpose, order and design, are terms correlative. We cannot see order without believing in design: our error is to presume too quickly that we *see* the design. In every organism there is a structural idea, towards which its development works, from the germ to the finished growth. Irrational beings work blindly towards their ends, fulfilling a purpose unknown to themselves. It is the distinction of rational beings to grasp the purpose of their structure, to will and seek their own ends, instead of passively accepting those determined for them; or, as Scripture puts it, to be 'workers together with God,' who 'worketh in us to will and to work.' We share our Maker's plans for us. Self-determination implies self-conceived ends. Each one of us has his ideals in life, whether wisely or unwisely formed, clearly or vaguely conceived, resolutely or slackly pursued. Those ideals hold the promise and potency of our future. What we mean to be, with real meaning, that we tend to be.

Now the goal tests the course. The proof of every system of morals lies in its doctrine of the *summum bonum*, of man's chief end. Only two reasoned answers to the question are possible; they have divided between them the schools of ethical thought, and the ranks of practical life, in all ages. The end of our present life, is it to be found in *character*, or in *pleasure*? My chief personal aim, is it to enjoy myself as much as possible, or to be as good and worthy a man as possible? No one denies that pleasure is desired, and desirable: few will question that virtue is desirable, and desired. But which is the main thing? which is to control and determine the other? Is the end of life intrinsic or extrinsic to our being? Has the soul a real value, or is it of use only as a machine to yield pleasure? Your answer and mine to this question cannot for a moment be doubtful. *Hedonism*, or the pleasure

theory of life, is in all its forms to be repelled. It is the great heresy in morals. Its results are disastrous, as its principles are degrading. Its prevalence is the forerunner of social and national decay. Select philosophers may, by their qualifications and refinements, escape the natural consequences of their doctrine. The common mind invariably understands by pleasure the sensuous and measurable enjoyments; and it is consistent in doing so, for the higher pleasures are only distinguished as higher by a criterion outside of pleasure, and are constituted pleasures only to a mind that loves the objects concerned on their own account. Accepting pleasure as the aim of life and the criterion of good, men come to regard prudence as the only restraint on their desires. So philosophy is made the patron of vice; and materialism in faith breeds sensualism in morals.

Thomas Carlyle, in his rough way, called Hedonism 'the Pig-philosophy.' But that was scarcely fair to the animal. The pig does not guzzle his swill impelled by a voluptuous imagination, but from the craving of his swinish nature for excessive food. If he could explain himself, he too is an idealist, and is working to fulfil the end imposed upon him by nature and the art of man, which is obesity,—certainly not an unmixed pleasure! Only man, through the perversion of his intellect, is capable of the debasement of Hedonism, of abstracting the delights attached to life's ends and erecting them into factitious ends on their own account, of becoming (in the language of Scripture) 'a lover of pleasure rather than a lover of God.' Hedonism is biologically, as well as ethically, false. Pleasure and pain are functional incidents; they are like the smooth working or jarring of machinery, and supply a zest or deterrent to action already in course. But to set them up for cardinal ends and prime motors is another thing. To be always hunting pleasure and dodging pain, and to make this pursuit and flight the guiding rule of conduct, is at once the meanest and the most futile theory of life that an intelligent being can frame.

In ourselves, and nowhere else, in our common rational manhood, must we seek the mark of our striv-

ings ; we climb upwards to reach the ideal self. We endorse Kant's noble maxim : ' So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end withal, and never as a means only.' When Aristotle and the old philosophers spoke of ' happiness,' and the saints of ' blessedness,' as the aim of life, they meant the soul's *welfare*, the highest state of personal being,—a state attended, as one must suppose, by suitable feelings of delight, but not constituted by those feelings, no more than the health dancing in the limbs of a happy child is determined by the laughing glee which is its witness. Health of soul and joy of heart are bound together, by the nature of things and the ordinance of God ; but to crave the former for the latter's sake, to desire goodness for the emoluments of goodness, is to go the sure way to lose both. Pleasure, the Hedonists say, determines desire, and desire determines good : good, we say, gives the law to desire, and desire gives birth to pleasure. It is not love, but lust, that loves for love's delights, and does not count the worth and beauty of the beloved its true prize.

The modern socialistic Hedonism, commonly termed Utilitarianism, is nobler than the old egotistic theory ; but only at the expense of consistency. It substitutes ' social utility ' for personal goodness as the end of moral action, and takes ' the greatest happiness of the greatest number ' for its watchword. But Utilitarianism is, strictly speaking, only a doctrine of *means*. I am bidden to pursue a certain course, because it is *useful* to the community. Very well : but useful, I ask, *to what end* ? what sort of happiness do you wish me to seek for ' the greatest number ' ? Is it the mere comforting of their bodies ; or is it, beyond and above that, the saving of their souls, that you intend ? In what can the welfare of a *number* of persons consist, however great, except in that which constitutes the welfare of each individual, the worth, the perfection, and consequent felicity, of personality itself, viz. character ? I do not think so meanly of my neighbour as to suppose that he will be content with pleasure, while I can only be satisfied with virtue. The end of life is

the same, for the single person and for the race. The greatest happiness of each lies in the greatest goodness of all. What makes you and me miserable is, that so many of our kind should be wicked. When the Good Shepherd laid down His life for the sheep, that was the act of supreme 'social utility.' Not when He turned the water into wine or made five loaves food for five thousand men (these were but incidents in His blessed work), but when He shed His blood to 'redeem us from iniquity,' was the grand service of Jesus Christ to our race accomplished.

We have now surveyed rapidly one side, the subjective aspect, of the ethical problem, glancing here and there at its objective bearing. We have sought for the basis of morality in our own constitution; and we have found that it is grounded in human reason, in the necessities of daily thought and action, and in the ends of life as we intelligently realise them for ourselves and for our fellows. But does this world of our moral experience exist for human thought alone? Is its source and issue confined to our own breasts, and to the horizon of the present? Men cannot, and do not, believe this. In the phenomena of moral life they find a witness, direct and manifold, to God and immortality. These two, as Kant affirmed, are the 'postulates of practical reason.' Many who, like Kant, distrust the arguments for the divine drawn from the external world, find here its irresistible proof.

Let me indicate, in a concluding paragraph or two, how this inference is drawn and how we pass from the psychological to the metaphysical view of ethics, how the moral personality of man assumes its basis in the eternal ground of things. Our human consciousness, being without a counterpart or explanation in the world of nature, reaches out to some *over* consciousness, some personal God, in whom it may rest and find its element; the finite spirit demands the infinite, as each atom of matter the boundless space. And if goodness is proper to the human person, is its essential excellence, such goodness, infinitely enhanced and glorified beyond human measure, we ascribe of necessity to *Him*; we conceive of God as 'the Holy One

who dwells in eternity,' such as we have seen Him in the face of Jesus Christ. Our conscience forbids the worship of any lesser or lower being, when once He is discerned. From such a One we can understand our existence as derived; and we see in humanity His blurred and broken, but still living image. Then we can account for the form of *law*, in which goodness addresses itself to us; for the majesty of *the right*, which rises immeasurably above civil legalities and tribal customs, and lends its sanctions and dignity to them; for the stern imperativeness of *duty*, and the fearful punishment its neglect entails in the lashings of remorse. There is a magnitude, a mystery about these phenomena, that speaks for the operation in them of a superhuman personal force, as the tides of the ocean are explained by no terrestrial cause, but by attractions issuing from the sky. Goodness we interpret as the image of God; right as the determination of His law; and duty as His daily and precise command. The consciousness of responsibility in us now reveals its meaning, arising as it does apart from human cognisance or censure; it is the soul's echo of the Omnipresent and Holy Consciousness of the universe, the sense, dim or clear within us, of the All-seeing Eye piercing the depths of the spirit. The sentence of our conscience rehearses, more or less faithfully, the pronouncement of the Supreme Tribunal, and notifies that 'every one of us must give account of himself to God.'

'If, as is the case,' wrote Cardinal Newman, 'we feel responsibility, are ashamed, are frightened at transgressing the voice of conscience, this implies that there is One to whom we are responsible, before whom we are ashamed, whose claims upon us we fear. If on doing wrong we feel the same tearful, broken-hearted sorrow which overwhelms us on hurting a mother; if on doing right we enjoy the same sunny serenity of mind which follows on receiving praise from a father—we certainly have within us the image of some Person to whom our love and veneration look, in whose smile we find our happiness, for whom we yearn, towards whom we direct our pleadings, in whose anger

we are troubled and waste away. These feelings within us are such as require for their exciting cause an intelligent being. . . . "The wicked flees when no man pursueth": then why does he flee? Whence his terror? Who is it that he sees in solitude, in darkness, in the hidden chambers of the heart?

For those who have known the LORD, the world is no longer a riddle, nor its moral problems insoluble and maddening. Cast down, they are not destroyed; perplexed, they are not in despair. The injustices and outrages of society, the apparent triumphs of evil, will not dishearten us, if we know that the present is a period of discipline and sifting, under His hand who will 'thoroughly purge His floor, and gather the wheat into His garner'; that there is enthroned on the seat of Almighty Power, and awaiting the hour decreed in Omniscient Wisdom, a 'Judge of the whole earth, who will do right.' In the light of this belief we trace the instalments of such justice dealt out in the life of men and nations; and history becomes to us, as we read it, an august and steady evolution of the eternal righteousness.

Finally, the end of life as conceived from the human standpoint, appears now to be but a relative end, a finite *summum bonum*, which points beyond itself to the infinite good, the absolute ground and end of being, which is God Himself. So the rivers flow back to the sea, the circle of existence is complete; and the stream of our brief lives moves onward with the moral universe, and with the march of the circling worlds, to the one sure issue, that 'GOD may be all in all.' 'Man's chief end,' as the old Catechism taught us, 'is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him for ever.' Happy they who have learnt that lesson early, and who hold it fast.

Here is the ultimate basis of morals. Here is the fountain of life, the light in which we see light. And all the prophets and preachers sing, with Samuel's mother—

There is none holy as the LORD;  
For there is none beside Thee:  
Neither is there any *rock* like our GOD!

## IRENÆUS ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

BY PROFESSOR GWATKIN.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), February, 1897.

DR. HARNACK'S latest work<sup>1</sup> is a monument of labour worthy of himself. Perhaps no other man could have packed into 727 pages so thorough an examination of all the chronological questions connected with early Christian literature as far as Irenæus. The single subject of St. John's writings is in itself a treatise far beyond the limits of discussion in a single paper. Yet there is one great question in it which seems to call for examination. Great weight has hitherto been assigned by most scholars to the evidence of Irenæus. To one side it has been a pillar of the truth, to the others a serious difficulty; but few have doubted its importance. Granted, indeed, that Polycarp was a disciple of the Apostle John and the teacher of Irenæus, the latter can hardly be mistaken in his clear, unhesitating testimony that the Apostle John, and not another, wrote the Fourth Gospel. But what if Polycarp was the hearer of another John, and Irenæus knew him but slightly, and only as a boy?—which is Dr. Harnack's contention. I will not stop to ask whether, even in that case, it need go for nothing. At all events, it will stand for something different. If it no longer gives us the explicit witness of the Apostle's own disciple, it will still represent the general belief of the time, challenged, indeed, by the Alogi, with their absurd ascription to Cerinthus, but seemingly undoubted in the wide circle of the Churches known to Irenæus. But can we set aside the old opinion, that the evidence goes back to the Apostle John, and not another John?

First let us note admitted facts. It is agreed (at least, by Dr. Harnack) that Polycarp was born about 69, and burnt in 155; that he was the disciple of a certain John in Asia; and that Irenæus fully believed this

<sup>1</sup> "Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius." Von Adolf Harnack. Erster Band (bis Irenæus). Leipzig. 1897.

John to have been the Apostle. It is also agreed that there was another John in Asia, whom Papias distinguishes as the elder, and also calls the Lord's disciple; and, further, that the letter of Irenæus to Florinus is quite genuine, and may be placed soon after 189. These data, I think, will suffice.

Dr. Harnack is our foremost student of the second century, at least since Lightfoot passed away. He writes more than most of us can read; and even when we are compelled to differ from his conclusions, we always find him full of erudition and suggestiveness. Yet at times the thought comes to me that the very strongest of scholars will be the stronger for it if he sometimes looks up from his wilderness of papers to the world around him, that he may take fuller account of the elementary feelings of human nature, which go so far to decide the meaning of the evidence before him. If these are "subjective" considerations which cannot easily be estimated, they are also facts which cannot safely be neglected. Too often in our readings we seem to be moving in a world of automata, who can hear a story and repeat it with more or less accuracy, but have little else about them that is human. I cannot help thinking that Dr. Harnack has treated the letter of Irenæus to Florinus a little too mechanically.

Florinus was a presbyter at Rome who fell into heresy, and to whom Irenæus writes:

"I saw thee when I was still a boy (*ἐν παις ὄν*) in Lower Asia, in company with Polycarp, while thou wast faring prosperously in the royal court, and endeavouring to stand well with him."<sup>1</sup>

Florinus then was a promising official when Irenæus was still a boy. What difference of age does this imply? "At least ten or fifteen years; probably more," answers Dr. Harnack. I venture to think otherwise. Half a dozen years are quite enough to make the difference between a boy at school and a man who is out in the world and getting on in it. Whatever, then, be the age of Florinus, we are not yet compelled to believe that Irenæus was more than a few years younger.

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot's translation, here and *infra*.



We go on with his letter :

" I distinctly remember the incidents of that time better than events of recent occurrence ; for the lessons received in childhood, growing with the growth of the soul, become identified with it ; so that I can describe the very place where the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and his personal appearance, and the discourses which he held before the people, and how he would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord, and about His miracles, and about His teaching, Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, would relate altogether in accordance with the Scriptures. To these discourses I used to listen with attention at the time by God's mercy which was bestowed upon me, noting them down, not on paper, but in my heart ; and by the grace of God I constantly ruminate upon them faithfully. And I can testify in the sight of God, that if the blessed and apostolic elder had heard anything of this kind [the heresy of Florinus], he would have cried out and stopped his ears, and said after his wont, ' O good God, for what times hast thou kept me that I should endure such things ? ' and would even have fled from the place where he was sitting or standing when he heard such words."

This he confirms by mentioning Polycarp's letters to the Churches round about.

The picture is drawn from the life, and Irenæus takes for granted that Florinus is as familiar with it as himself. A touch of " colouring " there may be, but any serious exaggeration would defeat its purpose. It is a boy's picture, if you will, but a boy's picture of a master whose every habit he has had time to learn thoroughly, not of a mere preacher " from whom he heard sermons, but with whom he had no further intercourse at all"—which is as much as Dr. Harnack (p. 328) thinks it needful to allow. How many of our own old teachers could we picture like this ? Few of us, I think, could name more than one or two. Every detail seems to speak of close observation and long-continued intercourse in the time which Irenæus chooses to describe as " when he was with Polycarp in Asia." Take the last point—Polycarp's energetic repudiation of heresy. Irenæus cannot have invented this. He must have seen Polycarp do things of the sort, and that often enough to make him sure that Florinus would recognise the picture. And was the blessed Polycarp in the habit of crying out, and stop-

ping his ears, and running away with his wonted exclamation, in the middle of his sermons? The whole passage seems to imply that Irenæus heard from him, not sermons only, but discussions and private teachings "about the Lord, and about His miracles, and about His teaching"—the sort of oral instruction in the facts of the Lord's life which is indicated in the preface to the Third Gospel. It is doubtless true that "Irenæus does not tell Florinus that he was a disciple of Polycarp." But why should he? Either Florinus was perfectly aware of the fact, or else he was not—especially if it was untrue. If he knew it quite well, these details of it would be an impressive and emphatic appeal; if he did not, they must be tedious, or worse than tedious. A recital of the fact would have suggested to us that he did not know it, or at least needed a reminder. So far, then, it would seem that Irenæus and Florinus were both disciples of Polycarp.

Now, what reasons are there against this conclusion? Dr. Harnack has several. In the first place, "Irenæus mentions here no memories but those of his childhood." It would be answer enough to say that these are the memories he tells us he remembers best. But they are also the memories which appealed best to Florinus, who was out in the world before Irenæus was a man. An appeal of this kind is necessarily to his earliest memories of Polycarp, and not to any later ones. Even if he remained "with him" to the end, he may well have thought that the public letters of Polycarp were more to his purpose than any private teaching he may have received in riper years.

Secondly, "He does not mention the fact in his letter to Victor." We must not be too sure of this, for we have not got the whole of the letter. His argument, however in the past preserved, is not about Polycarp or himself, but about Victor's predecessors; and Polycarp only comes in because Anicetus discussed the Eastern question with him. There was no occasion to obtrude on Victor the personal recollections which might be effective with Florinus.

In the third place, "If he had had any later memories

of Polycarp, he would not have needed to ruminate on those of his childhood." Not *needed*, perhaps; but it may have been an old man's preference. The voices we heard in childhood come back with a new tenderness across a gulf of half a century. That Irenæus was old seems clear from the way he begins, by saying how much better he remembers the lessons of his childhood, and how he loves to ruminate on them. This is hardly the language of a man very much under sixty.

Fourthly, "He never speaks but once again' of the intercourse with Polycarp; and then he only says, "Whom we also saw in our early youth." This, Dr. Harnack thinks, "shuts out all possibility that Irenæus was a disciple of Polycarp after he became a man." It seems strong; but we must look at the context. Irenæus has just traced down the series of the bishops of Rome—twelve, from the apostles to Eleutherus, "who now holds the office." But Polycarp, he goes on, was a still better depositary of tradition, for his life was a single link connecting the apostles who appointed him with our own time. I cannot see that Irenæus was bound to say more, or to explain here precisely how much more he may have known of Polycarp. The words do not suggest any later intercourse—rather the contrary; but they do not deny it.

It must be allowed that Irenæus does not quote Polycarp's interpretations of Scripture, as we should expect. But a teacher's influence is far too subtle a thing to be measured by the number of a disciple's express references to him. One consideration may help us. Polycarp is one of the least intellectual of writers; his letter to the Philippians is as commonplace as it well can be. His influence was the influence of saintliness, not of intellect; so that he is not likely to have said many of the striking things we remember through life. It may be doubted whether such a man troubled himself much about interpretations at all. In any case, by far the largest part of what he said would be

<sup>1</sup> Hær. III., iii. 4, ὅν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐωράκαμεν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίῃ.

merged, as Irenæus gives us to understand, in the general record of Scripture.

As regards the age of Irenæus himself, we may fix his birth somewhere about 130. A much earlier date seems excluded by his relation to Florinus, while the elderly tone running through his letter is against a much later one. He "was with Polycarp" while still a boy (*ἔτι παῖς ὢν*); but we need not press this "in the strict sense; not over, say fifteen." The word *παῖς* is not quite the same as *boy* or *Kind*; for Lightfoot gives cases where it is used more loosely for a man of thirty, or even older.<sup>1</sup> If, then, there is nothing else on the way, the word *παῖς* will not forbid us to suppose that Irenæus was a youth of eighteen or twenty before his intercourse with Polycarp came to an end. And this is the age indicated by his other phrase, "in our first youth" (*ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ*). If *ἡλικία* is not used of age indefinitely, nor yet with definite reference to the successive ages of man, we must take it in its common sense of manhood; so that "our first *ἡλικία*" will mean, say eighteen or twenty. Neither can we safely assume that Polycarp was then in his very last years. Irenæus says, not that he was an old man then, but that he was "a very old man (*πάννυ γηραλέος*) when he died a glorious death" at the age of eighty-six. Moreover, Polycarp's last year is out of the question, for he was away in Rome. We do not even know when Irenæus left Smyrna, though we cannot trace his presence at Polycarp's death in 155. Upon the whole, he would seem to have been a disciple of Polycarp about 145-150, or possibly a little longer.

Let us now put things together. Irenæus has made mistakes, and some of them are serious. Thus, he is most likely wrong when he tells us that Papias was a

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot "Ignatius," i. 443. Dr. Harnack looks with favour on a suggestion that the words of Irenæus ("I used to listen with attention by God's mercy which was bestowed upon me") are a hint that he was a very small and forward boy. Are they not rather an expression of thankfulness that he had found Polycarp's teaching so useful in his later years?

disciple of the apostle (instead of the elder) John. May he not have made precisely the same mistake about Polycarp? Nothing more likely, answers Dr. Harnack. From my point of view, there is nothing more unlikely. The mistake about Papias was easy, for there is no reason to suppose that Irenæus had more than a trifling personal acquaintance with him, if the dates will allow even that. His book is much, but he is himself no more than "a companion of Polycarp." That one phrase is warning enough that the case is very different with Polycarp himself. He was born about 69, held familiar intercourse (*συναναστροφὴν*) with John, and "with many others who had seen Christ," and used to tell "the stories he had heard from them about the Lord, and about His miracles, and about His teaching." There must have been a great difference, perhaps in the stories themselves, and certainly in the telling of them, between the Lord's own apostle and the elder John, who did not belong to the inner circle of the disciples. One was many times an eye-witness of what the other could tell only from hearsay. It is hard to suppose that Polycarp's discourses did not often enough show plainly which of the two Johns had been his teacher. Did he never tell how the Baptist pointed out the Lamb of God? Or did he leave out the Crucifixion from his teacher's Gospel? It is, if possible, harder still to doubt that all the Churches knew perfectly well which of the two had taught "the Teacher of Asia, the Father of the Christians," as even heathens called him. Had his old companions left no memories behind? Were there none still living, a little younger than himself? Both the apostle and the elder John, or whichever of them lived to see Trajan emperor in 98, must have been within the memory of younger men than Polycarp some fifty years later. Yet again, consider what sort of a memory we cherish in our advancing years of a teacher whom we knew and venerated as Irenæus knew and venerated Polycarp. We used to think with Irenæus

<sup>1</sup> Hær. III., iii. 4, *συναναστραφεὶς πολλοῖς τοῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἑωρακόσιν.*

himself that the memories of early life are the most indelible of all. When some trifle recalls them, we often see them returning even in extreme old age with all the vividness and certainty of yesterday. No memory of my own youth stands out more utterly beyond the reach of mistake than the fact that Dr. Butler, and not another, was the teacher of my own old master Kennedy, and this, though Kennedy may not have told us very much about him. We could see him well enough behind even Kennedy's mighty presence. My memory no doubt is helped by that of many an old companion; but had Irenæus no companions? Or did he never meet any of them again? Or were they all mistaken with him? Human nature must be much the same in all ages, and it was the life's work of both Polycarp and Irenæus to keep the deposit entrusted to them. I see no escape from the conclusion that this is more than almost any other a question on which it is hardly in human nature that Irenæus can be mistaken when he tells us that the Apostle John, and not another, was the teacher of his own old master Polycarp.

Dr. Harnack will see that I am not trying to follow him over the whole field of the Johannean problem. I have not even touched his discussion of the kindred questions about Papias, though here again he has given us much food for thought. I have but singled out one great question, in the conviction, which no doubt I share with him, that whoever mistakes the evidence of Irenæus is likely to mistake the wider problem too.

---

### MELANCHTHON, THE THEOLOGIAN.<sup>1</sup>

BY REV. PROFESSOR HENRY E. JACOBS, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Lutheran* (Philadelphia), February 18, 1897.

It is late in the summer of 1518. Sixteen years before, in an insignificant Saxon town, on a malarious plain, almost on the borders of civilization, as Luther

<sup>1</sup> Abstract of an address, Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, February 15th, 1897.

used to say, containing three thousand extremely poor people, living in frame huts, with straw-thatched roofs, the most influential University of modern times has been founded. Thirty teachers and several hundred students are listening, with strained attention, to a young man of twenty-one, of less than medium stature, delicate frame, and noticeably stuttering speech. At the beginning, the embarrassment had been painful; but, as he proceeds, from beneath his high forehead, his bright eyes gleam with extraordinary animation, a peculiarly amiable and intellectual expression illumines his classical features, while his hands and entire body are in constant action, with an almost unconscious gesticulation. To that address, the one man in that audience, who, above all others, is regarded as the chief representative of the University, is as responsive as any of the students, who are carried away with enthusiasm for the new professor, as the representative of the rising generation. He has at last found the very associate that he needs for the great conflict that has just opened. From that moment, their lives and labors combine in such a way, that they cannot be separated. Henceforth, Luther speaks to scholars and courts through Melanchthon, and Melanchthon lives in Luther; Luther breaks the way, and Melanchthon builds the road after him.

Their very contrasts rendered them more efficient as co-laborers. The one was from the peasantry; the other from the townsmen. The one had wrestled long with poverty; the other came from a home that had never known want. The one had suffered—from unsympathetic and even brutal teachers; the other had been stimulated by instructors who had appreciated the privilege of having such an exceptionally gifted pupil, and had been the pride of Germany's greatest scholar, his near relative. The one had gained his position in the face of constant opposition, the other had been carried forward, without any effort, save that necessary to discharge, with fidelity, every duty assigned him. The religious life of the one had been one of unremitting conflict; that of the other was none

the less genuine, for not having passed through the same experience. The depth of religious earnestness and intensity of the one, are supplemented by the width of learning and variety of attainments of the other. The one is the restorer of Evangelical Christianity; the other the founder of modern Theological Science. It was the office of Melanchthon to arrange and classify the results, that had, thus far, been attained; to reduce the doctrinal statements of Luther to accurate expression; to guard against misconceptions and misrepresentations, to which the ardor of Luther's nature rendered him liable; to call into service the wealth of his classical learning, in the exposition of the text of Holy Scripture; to test the adversaries of the truth by their own standards, and expose their inconsistencies and absurdities; and to determine the method for the theological investigations and discussions of succeeding ages. Luther spake and wrote, as a divinely called teacher of the one, abiding, unchangeable saving truth of God's Word; Melanchthon, as the representative of humanity, in its endeavors to appropriate and confess the Divine Revelation, in faltering and inadequate statements, needing revision and restatement, with ever changing times and opponents.

How touching their tributes to each other! "I prefer," says Luther, "these books of Master Philip to my own. I was born to fight with fanatics and devils; my books, therefore, are stormy and war-like. I have to break the clods, and tear up the stumps, and hew out the thorns and hedges, and fill up the marshes, and am the rough pioneer who breaks the way through the forest; but Master Philip moves along calmly and gently, and builds and plants, sows and waters, with pleasure, as God has richly endowed him with his gifts."

"What would we do," writes Luther, a few weeks before his death, pleading that Melanchthon be spared a journey in the midst of winter, "what would we do, if Master Philip were to die? Hereafter, we must manage to keep him at home; for he is of more use, here, in his bed, than there in a colloquium."



"Luther," says Melanchthon, "is another Elias, to prepare the way of the Lord. I would rather die than be separated from that man." Throughout his life, he always addresses Luther as *carissimo patri*, "my most beloved father," and, after his death, regularly celebrated the birthday of his departed father in Christ. Not only did he deliver a most eloquent tribute at the funeral of Luther, but, in after years, referred to it as his permanent testimony, repeating also the same estimates in his prefaces to the numerous volumes of Luther's works, printed at Wittenberg, under his supervision. Upon Melanchthon fell the care of Luther's widow and children, in all the peculiarly sad hours that followed, especially when they were driven into exile by the calamities of war. The friend of the head of the family, to whom they ever looked for advice and assistance, was Melanchthon. Differences there were, and that, too, concerning matters of no small moment, and that occasioned, at the time, no little feeling; but, with them all, they remained nearer to each other than to any one else.

So interdependent were these two friends, that, especially during the first period of their association, there seems to be scarcely any important document, bearing the name of either, that was not the fruit of their mutual consultations. An illustration may be found even in that book which, above all others, is known by Luther's name—the Small Catechism. On the basis of work done by Luther in 1518, Melanchthon had wrought in his *Loci* of 1521, and the Visitation Articles of 1527 and 1528; and, these again, especially the latter, were called into service, by Luther, when the Large Catechism had expanded, far beyond the limits of a popular work. We call the attention of students to the general identity of the matter, as well as to the resemblance in expression, that are too close to be regarded as mere coincidences. In like manner, Luther's matchless Introduction to the Epistle to the Romans, is largely a re-elaboration and condensation of Melanchthon's presentation of Luther's own thoughts. The part which each took in the preparation of the

Augsburg Confession, the fundamental Creed of modern Christianity, published the year in which Copernicus announced his discovery of the solar system, Melanchthon has himself recorded. The clear and simple statements, determined by the joint labor of these two friends, give no indication of the great pains bestowed upon every sentence, and, even on every word, or, of the many controversies, in view, in the choice of its discriminating language.

Protestant Systematic Theology owes its origin to what seems almost an accident. For his own use, Melanchthon made a summary of the argument and terms used in the Epistle to the Romans, and this summary published prematurely by his own students, rendered his own revision and completion of the work a matter, as to which he had no choice. The Formal Principle of Protestantism—which some would have us believe was only an after-thought of Lutheranism—he enunciated, almost in the very language afterwards adopted by the Formula of Concord, as early as February, 1520. To Melanchthon Paul was the great theologian of Christianity, and the Epistle to the Romans, the text-book of Theology. The main effort of Theology should be to master this epistle, and, from it, as a center, to consider the other books.

Never satisfied with anything that he had written, he was the type of a progressive scholar, constantly seeking, by repeated revisions, to make his treatment clearer, to add the results of new investigations, to embody the very latest of officially approved statements, to discuss the living questions of the hour, to refute the most recent opponents, and constantly to approach a higher standard of completion. His entire habit of mind exacted the most rigid and explicit definitions. If, at certain important junctures, he hesitated to give as explicit a declaration of his faith as was desired, the explanation is, in large measure, that he feels himself bound by his representative capacity. He held himself constrained, when officially commissioned to state the Church's doctrine, to present the settled teaching of the Church, and to confine himself

within the limits of definitions already given by Church teachers of recognized authority. In the lack of these, he is always asking that a Synod be called to settle the definition. When such decision has been given, it supersedes for him all that has been previously formulated. His great weakness lies in his dependence upon external authorities—a weakness which, if consistently developed, would have been fatal to the formal principle of Protestantism that he had so well enunciated.

The concession to the Romanizing side, that the exclusive particle "alone" might be suppressed in the statement of the article of Justification, is accompanied with such qualifications and explanations; and, with such argument, to disprove Rome's claims, on this topic, that it should be treated only as a plunder of no significance, except in the unfair use that was made of it; especially so, too, as he acknowledged the formal error, and never wavered in his treatment of the Article. When a serious Romanizing aberration from the evangelical doctrine appeared in the teaching of Osiander, it is to Melanchthon that the Lutheran Church is indebted for the clear distinctions and the final settlement of the subject in the Formula of Concord.

On the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, there is no evidence that he ever abandoned the explanation of Luther. If the testimony of any one is worthy of consideration, it is that of his pupil, Nicholas Selnecker, whose soundness is undisputed, and whose part in the preparation of the Formula of Concord is well known. He maintains that there was not even in the slightest point, the least variation from the teaching of Luther. He affirms that Melanchthon repeatedly declared that: "When Calvin writes to me, I cannot make out what he wants, and must read the letter over two or three times, before I can catch his meaning." Calvin complained that for three years, Melanchthon neglected his letters. Add to this, the fact that Melanchthon himself constantly declares that there has been no change from the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and the Visitation Articles of 1528. The as-

sertion of his conversion to Calvinism is a reflection upon his honesty.

The changes in the Variata of the Augsburg Confession have no doctrinal significance. They were intended to introduce into the Augsburg Confession all the definitions of doctrine that, up to date, had been officially approved in the Lutheran churches. That in Art. X. is intended to introduce the statement of the Wittenberg Concord, as that which had supplanted the statement of precisely the same doctrine of the Confession of 1530. In like manner, the treatment of the subject of Justification, introduces a summary of the statements of the Apology, guarding the definition as presented in 1530, from ambiguities, that its author was free to acknowledge. This explains the fact that Luther never made any serious protest. Melancthon knew that the Confession of 1530 could not, in the nature of the case, be adequate amidst all circumstances that would arise afterwards in the Church. It was the very answer demanded for the adversaries, then in view, and for the hour, at which it was written; but it is unreasonable to bind the Church forever to the precise definitions of one hour and crisis, in such way as to preclude a presentment of the same truths, in a varied form, adapted to new issues, and to new forms of old errors.

Melancthon's position as a theologian cannot be appreciated without recalling the circumstances under which he toiled and wrote and negotiated. We must consider his always frail health, the daily fastings—since he rarely allowed himself more than one meal a day—the nightly vigils—since he rested from early supper to midnight, and, from midnight until daylight, did his solid work—the insomnia that often broke in upon his few hours of rest. We must remember his extremely delicate sensibilities, that apprehended dangers and enmities, where there were none; his family cares, that almost crushed him by parental disappointments; his arduous labors, without any vacation; his incessant writing of books; his enormous correspondence, not only with intimate friends, but

also with strangers and enemies, not only with scholars, but also with kings, princes and ministers of state ; his frequent journeys, in inclement weather, and with all the discomforts of those times ; his protracted absences from his family and students and books, in the discharge of uncongenial duties. We must remember, also, his superstitions, that were not altogether dispelled by his enlightened views in other matters. A lunar halo, the varying shapes of clouds, a flash of lightning, the direction of a comet's tail—all had meanings to him that they have not to us. We must remember, that those charged with responsible trusts cannot always explain the reasons of their course in all its details, but must await, in silence, the hour of their vindication ; and that enmities must be anticipated, whenever any important advance is made in reforming the doctrine, reorganizing the government and removing the abuses in the Church, not only from those who may be directly affected by such changes, but also from those whose extreme conservatism repudiates being disturbed, or whose radicalism can brook no restraint. In his correspondence, Melanchthon shows little caution, and, with his benevolent disposition, completely gives himself away to any one, for whom he has ordinary regard. With amazing simplicity, he makes comparative strangers his confidants, and pours forth his heart, concerning the most private matters.

Indiscreet in criticisms of Luther to those who had no business with family secrets, they are neither insincere nor inconsistent with his loyalty to the one criticised ; and yet, they must necessarily have aroused the indignation of those who saw how such simplicity was abused. All the sympathy of the two Reformers with each other, could not obliterate the fact, that they came from different circles of society, and different walks in life.

The cultivated scholar and delicate gentleman was shocked by the frequent outburst of boisterousness and roughness, by one who was of the people, and spake for, and to the people, in vigorous Saxon, that no one could mistake. He missed, in Luther, that calm, and

discriminative treatment of adversaries, and that moderation of language, that were his own models in controversy. Was it strange, on the other hand, that Luther was sorely tried, more than once, in viewing, from a distance, a battle, in which Melanchthon seemed to him to be dealing in sugar-coated pills, instead of treating the enemy with dynamite bombs; aye, perhaps, even exchanging compliments, where he should have been wielding thunderbolts, to completely destroy their defenses? Luther often saw that the right word in the right place, would save many future battles. Even where Melanchthon was blameless, as probably at the time of their most serious misunderstanding, viz.: that concerning the Reformation of Cologne, Luther's knowledge of his associate's disposition and methods rendered him apprehensive and suspicious, until Melanchthon was once more with him, or he learned all the details. Partisans were busy, and after Luther's death, every indiscretion of Melanchthon was recalled; while, on the other hand, indiscreet friends surrounded Melanchthon, and involved him in conflicts and betrayed him into positions that he never would have assumed, if left to himself. The unfortunate letter to Carlowitz, April 28th, 1548, may be noted as probably his most serious mistake. Judgment concerning his concessions to Rome concerning church ceremonies, must be moderated by his well-known preferences for everything in the Church that was historically approved, and his more extensive knowledge of the original intention of much that Rome had perverted. But, on this point, his own acknowledgment of the incorrectness of the principle involved, in accepting and adopting the badges of the false doctrines of the Papacy, as the condition of peace with it, should be sufficient. The prohibition of meat on Fridays and Saturdays, and during Lent; extreme unction; the requirement of ordination by bishops in the so-called Apostolic Succession; the enforcement of the use of candles, and the canonically approved vestments, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, were among these concessions that created a storm

from which he fled the more precipitately because, even when proposed, he was not sure of his position.

Forty-two years have passed since the youthful professor awakened the enthusiasm of that audience of scholars as he outlined the work that he proposed to perform. Unlike the programs of most teachers, the results were vastly beyond the promises. Who, in 1518, could have imagined that such a frail body could so long endure such heavy responsibilities or discharge such varied and important offices so well? His errors we dare not cover or conceal without being untrue to history and unjust to those who suffered from them. But we trace them with the same tender hand that we use when we examine the lives of the apostles, whom we seek to follow only as they themselves are followers of Christ. Endeavoring, for an entire generation, to construct a basis for the Church, as a visible organization, his constant endeavors to bring together into one well-organized body all the children of God, have been a succession of failures. At length he has learned the great lesson of his life, viz., that the existence of the Church is a matter, not of sight, but of faith. He confesses that it is his great consolation, that he can say: I believe that there is a Holy Christian Church, the Communion of Saints. There is no gradual fading of the twilight into night. Crowded with labors and cares to the very last, he is absent from his lecture-room for only two or three days, until he enters that higher school, where he longs to exchange the place of an honored teacher and leader for that of an humble pupil in the lowest class. Calmly he sits by his table to prepare his first lesson. Drawing a line through a sheet of paper, he writes, on the one side, the miseries of life, from which death will free him. They culminate in deliverance from the turmoil and confusion and rage of theological controversy. Then, on the other side, the chief of all the positive blessing that he anticipates, is the clear understanding of the mystery of the union of the two natures in the person of Christ. All eternity is to be spent in the study of the one theme of Christology. The final moment soon comes. As

earth fades from his senses, he is asked : " Is there anything that you want ? " He softly answers : " Nothing but Heaven . " Then the din of battle dies forever upon his ears, and the promise is fulfilled, " Thou shalt hide them in the secret of Thy presence from the pride of man : Thou shalt keep them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues . "

---

### DR. ABBOTT ON " ORTHODOXY . "

From *The Christian Advocate* (New York), February 18, 1897.

DR. LYMAN ABBOTT, finding his views condemned by the Congregational ministers of Brooklyn and vicinity, with but very few exceptions, and his attitude claimed as belonging to the so-called liberal Churches, of which the Unitarians are the type, attempts a very difficult task, namely, to define orthodoxy. The definition is of course so constructed as to include himself, but he is obliged to repeat more than once that the line which separates orthodoxy and heterodoxy is a shadowy one.

" The unorthodox teacher," he says, " believes only in error and culture, while the orthodox believes in sin and salvation. . . . The so-called liberal school looks upon the world's disease as chiefly in the moral understanding, and depends upon ethical culture for remedy, while the so-called orthodox school looks upon the world's disease as chiefly in the will, and depends upon the Gospel to furnish the will with new motives and new strength to act upon them. "

He affirms that the orthodox man may believe as much or as little about Moses and the Pentateuch as he pleases : " Or he may believe that Moses did not write a line. He may believe that inspiration ended with the apostolic age, or that it continues to this day. He may believe all the supposed miracles in the Bible, including that of the sun standing still, and add thereto belief in all the ecclesiastical miracles down to and including those of the waters of Lourdes ; or he may



discriminate between different miracles, accepting some and rejecting others." He says: "He may believe that Jesus Christ is God and man, or that He was perfect God, clothed with all the wisdom and power of God on earth, or that He was the Spirit of God in a human body, or that He was a man in whom the Spirit of God tabernacled. He may reject any of the old-time theories of inspiration, miracles, or incarnation, or other cognate doctrines, and still be orthodox."

He says that "the question, What is orthodoxy? cannot be dismissed with the current joke, Orthodoxy is my doxy; heterodoxy is your doxy."

If there is a real difference between the orthodox and the heterodox parties in the Protestant Church, it is certainly not a question for jokes, current or otherwise. But orthodox and heterodox are practically amalgamated in his exposition; for with the exception of the extreme left of the liberal teachers, they will deny his description of them and their views, and he gives up so much that it would be impossible for any one going forth with the spirit of the apostles and evangelists, and employing either their language or their methods, to co-operate with him.

When Sir John A. Macdonald, the Canadian Premier, was asked on a certain occasion whether he was orthodox or heterodox, he replied: "Put me down paradox." He intended this for a witticism, though it was true to some extent; for he seemed so orthodox at times, and spoke and acted so inconsistently with that view at other times, as to present in his character and conduct a paradox.

A close study of Dr. Abbott's utterances—not in the sensational reports against which he justly complains, but in the carefully prepared editorials and signed articles in *The Outlook*—leads to the conclusion that he is not orthodox in any sense which justifies his indorsement by those who desire to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." And his personal character, philanthropic instincts and actions, diversified accomplishments, and abundant resources of speech and of the press, render him far more

dangerous to the integrity of the Gospel system and to the influence of the evangelical Churches, than any other person who has arisen in this country since the early days of the great Unitarian secession in New England.

It is true that he closes in a sublime strain: "To be orthodox is to believe that for us men and for our salvation the prophets of old times spoke, the witness in wondrous works was given, and the Christ of God came down from heaven." But when "prophets of old times, speaking" are compared with his interpretation of particular parts of the Scripture, "the witnesses in wondrous works" with his views on various of them, and permission is given to hold anything concerning Christ, from "absolute man tabernacled by the Spirit" to absolute God, what estimate can be placed upon the situation?

What but this: If orthodoxy can be attenuated and made heterogeneous to the extent proposed by Dr. Abbott, it will have no more power against infidelity, false religion, or absorption in this material present life, than gold leaf and gauze would have against cannon balls and bullets.

In the article, "What is Orthodoxy?" he speaks of those who are opposing his views as "self-appointed defenders of the faith," and over a signed interview in a paper other than his own, says:

I think the counsel given by Dr. John Watson (Ian Maclaren) to the students at Yale is wise counsel: "Ministers might very well copy the etiquette of the medical profession, which is distinguished by the respect its members show to one another. No minister should criticise another minister in public."

This seems like a plea for free course to spread his ideas, whatever they may be, without public dissent; and the analogy will not bear inspection.

Every Christian is a divinely appointed defender of the faith. Ministers perform their work in public, physicians in private. If a physician were to take the platform, or over his own signature were to advance doctrines which in the opinion of the medical profession generally were calculated to impair public con-

fidence in the science and practice of medicine and in themselves, the case would then be paralleled, and the medical profession would not only promptly reply, but as promptly, if the facts were sustained, expel the physician from their associations.

We do not count ourselves "self-appointed," since those who ordained us required us to "be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines," and on the basis of that pledge we were intrusted with the management of *The Christian Advocate*.

# I.

## JONAH.

*The Outlook* of February 6 contains Dr. Abbott's defense of his rejection of the historical accuracy of what he calls "the Jonah story." He says :

One does not treat the parable of the trees in Judges, chapter ix, irreverently because he sees in it a satire on the political folly of the men of Shechem. . . . As little is it lacking in reverence to see in the story of Jonah and the great fish a satire on the narrowness of certain Judaistic teachers of the second or third century before Christ, and an exposition, in contrast, of "the wideness of God's mercy, like the wideness of the sea." Nor is there anything in Scripture, except the structure of the book itself, to determine for the reverent student of the Bible which of these views he shall take. The only passage cited is the verse in Matthew : "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." The Pharisees had demanded of Christ a sign. According to both Matthew and Luke, He refused to give any sign ; according to Luke, He added that "as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation." That His words stop here, and that the additional words in Matthew are a note added, possibly by Matthew, more probably by some early copyist, is reasonably believed, because (1) the Ninevites knew nothing, so far as the history indicates, of Jonah's sea experiences ; it was at his preaching, as Christ Himself elsewhere says, that they repented ; (2) Christ was not three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, but one day and two nights ; (3) and, finally, the very gist of Christ's reply, which was a refusal to give the Pharisees any sign, is set aside by the supposition that He promised them the greatest of all signs—His own resurrection. This sign was given later, but not to them ; He appeared only to His own disciples. For these reasons we think, as many biblical scholars think, that it is a mistake to quote the words given above as the words of Christ.

This defense is inadequate. Jotham had no standing as a prophet, and plainly uttered a satirical fable. Jonah was recognized elsewhere in the Old Testament and by Jesus, both in Matthew and Luke, as a prophet of a high order :

2 Kings xiv. 25 : " He restored the coast of Israel from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the plain, according to the word of the Lord God of Israel, which He spake by the hand of His servant Jonah, the son of Amittai, the prophet, which was of Gath-hepher."

Matt. xii. 38-41 : " Then certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign from Thee. But He answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign ; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas : for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it : because they repented at the preaching of Jonas ; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here."

Luke xi. 29, 30, 32 : " And when the people were gathered thick together, He began to say, This is an evil generation : they seek a sign ; and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of Jonas the prophet. For as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation. . . . The men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it : for they repented at the preaching of Jonas ; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here."

The statement that the people of Nineveh knew nothing, " so far as the history indicates, of Jonah's sea experiences" is without weight. For " so far as the history indicates" means but little with reference to public characters and missions, as against a strong probability. A preacher who had had such an experience would be most likely to refer to it, it being a reinforcement of his commission, and a demonstration of its vast importance not surpassed nor even paralleled. Nor does the Bible profess to give all details.

The Christian Church has always explained the reference to three days and three nights upon the method of computing time common among the Jews. Christ gave no sign to the generation. He did not offer them any sign. But the reference to Jonah caused Him, much after His manner, to make a reference to the crown and consummation of all His miracles.

The intimation that the additional words are a note

added "possibly by Matthew, more probably by some early copyist," when there is not the slightest evidence that such was the case, belongs to a method of reasoning that would undermine any passage in the word of God opposed to a favorite theory. Why does not the unbeliever in the historical reality of Jonah's sea experiences suggest that Luke omitted certain words which Matthew supplied? Though the new revision omitted certain passages supposed to be interpolations, there being not the slightest reason for supposing this to be such it is retained. Is there not reason to fear that, if Luke had contained the same words, a similar theory would have been brought in to eliminate them?

No Christian can reject an account in the Bible merely because it is miraculous. Should he reject one account for that reason exclusively, logically he should reject all. But Dr. Abbott himself says that the story of Jonah is not rejected as literal history by him and those who think with him because of the miracle of the great fish; "that is not a greater miracle than others, not so great as some."

A study of the Book of Jonah shows abundance of reasons for the miracle. The prophet, not wishing to go upon a mission imposed upon him, not fully aware that the God of the Hebrews was the God of the whole universe, fancied that he could escape. A miracle was wrought to teach him that the God of the Hebrews "is the Most High, the God of gods and Lord of lords." When the violence of the tempest destroyed hope, the mariners "cried every man to his own god." The miracle of the tempest was followed by the miracle of the great fish. The tempest converted the mariners, who prayed to Jonah's God, and when the sea ceased from her raging these men "feared the Lord exceedingly, and offered a sacrifice unto the Lord, and made vows."

The psalm and prayer of Jonah are among the most beautiful of the compositions of the Old Testament, and his humble and grateful ascription and renewed vows are most touching: "When my soul fainted within me I remembered the Lord: and my prayer

came in unto Thee, into Thine holy temple. They that observe lying vanities forsake their own mercy. But I will sacrifice unto Thee with the voice of thanksgiving; I will pay that that I have vowed. Salvation is of the Lord."

The great lesson taught by the treatment of Jonah when he wished the people to be destroyed merely because he had declared that they should be, is worthy of a comparison with any similar lesson in the holy book.

The closing part of *The Outlook's* treatment of this subject seems to us the most curious passage in all literary criticism :

Outside of ecclesiastical circles this story invariably produces a smile. Might not this suggest that it was intended by the author to produce a smile?

We could not have believed that such a passage would find its way into an editorial in *The Outlook*.

The story never produces a smile where its spirit is understood and felt. Because of the fish it was easily seized upon by the infidel and the scoffer as a subject of ridicule, and is peculiarly adapted in some of its phrases to suggest amusing conundrums. Theologians have sometimes made it ludicrous by attempting to account for the phenomena on natural grounds. But it is impossible for one who has not sophisticated himself, not to discover that it is the most gravely serious of accounts; that Jonah was regarded by Jesus as a prophet of a high order, and that the account of the transaction is a literal history. So the Hebrews believed, as appears from the references of Tobit and Josephus.

We do not wonder that Colonel Ingersoll at once seized upon the incident and endeavored to ally himself to the preacher who would deny the literal truth of that narrative, and strive to eliminate from the gospel of Matthew a passage in the way of such denial.

There is, however, nothing original either in Dr. Abbott's view of this subject, or Ingersoll's. For, as Dr. Abbott declares, "it was written as a piece of

satirical fiction to satirize the narrowness of certain prophets. Thomas Paine wrote :

It is more probable that it is a book of the Gentiles than of the Jews ; and that it has been written as a fable, to expose the nonsense and satirize the vicious and malignant character of a Bible prophet or a predicting priest. (Age of Reason, Part II.)

## II.

### ABRAHAM.

There is some danger that too much attention will be paid to Jonah, and it may be thought that upon the great outlines of the Old Testament the pastor of Plymouth Church and editor of *The Outlook* is in harmony with the views of orthodox Christians generally.

But the story of Jonah's punishment and deliverance is not thrust out alone. It goes in good company ; for the most important event in Abraham's life after he first heard the voice of God, goes with it, according to Dr. Abbott.

In *The Outlook* for January 23, 1897, Dr. Abbott, over his own signature, says : " He who thus regards the Bible is not in the least troubled about finding errors in it ; he expects to find such errors. They do not in the least militate against the value of the book." He then gives a list of specimen errors in the Bible. It is quite immaterial to him that the world was not made in six days ; that there never was a universal deluge ; that "*Abraham mistook the voice of conscience calling on him to consecrate his only son to God, and interpreted it as a command to slay his son as a burnt offering.*"

Concerning the first and the second of these we say nothing at this time. But we oppose the Bible account to what Dr. Abbott has said :

And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham ; and he said, Behold, here I am. And he said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah ; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.

Then comes the detailed account down to the point where the tragedy approaches completion :

And Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son. And the angel of the Lord called unto him out of heaven, and said, Abraham, Abraham : and he said, Here am I. And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him : for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me. And Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked, and behold behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns : and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son. And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh : as it is said to this day, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen.

Then follows the covenant of God with Abraham :

And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord ; for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son ; that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the seashore ; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies ; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed ; because thou hast obeyed My voice.

To this plainly historical narrative, moving from the beginning to the end with the stateliness and precision worthy of a God, Dr. Abbott opposes the statement : "*Abraham mistook the voice of conscience calling on him to consecrate his only son to God, and interpreted it as a command to slay his son as a burnt offering.*"

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says :

By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac ; and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son, of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called : accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead ; from whence also he received him in a figure.

Against this explicit statement Dr. Abbott says : "*Abraham mistook the voice of conscience calling on him to consecrate his only son to God, and interpreted it as a command to slay his son as a burnt offering.*"

James says :

Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar ? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect ? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness : and he was called the Friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.

But the testimony of James is of little account to



Lyman Abbott, who opposes to it these words : "*Abraham mistook the voice of conscience calling on him to consecrate his only son to God, and interpreted it as a command to slay his son as a burnt offering.*"

Most truthfully does he say in the article from which we quote :

The question at issue between the modern critic [of the type of Dr. Abbott—Editor *Christian Advocate*] and the old orthodoxy is not an insignificant one. It is not merely a question of dates and authorship—a question whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or how many of the Psalms were written by David, or whether there were two Isaiahs or only one. It is a profoundly serious thing. The old orthodoxy is right in regarding the new criticism as revolutionary. It is revolutionary in its treatment of the Bible, as the Protestant Reformation was revolutionary in its treatment of the Church. It denies the infallibility of the Bible as the Protestant Reformation denied the infallibility of the Church.

The last sentence contains a typical illustration of the specious and consequently deceptive element in the style of Dr. Abbott in dealing with these subjects. The Protestant impeachment of the Roman Catholic Church was based on its assumed contradictions of the supreme standard of the Bible.

## MORE ABOUT JONAH.

BY DWIGHT L. MOODY.

From *The Independent* (New York), February 11, 1897.

I AM not gladder for having said anything in a long while than I am for my recent words about Jonah. They have been quoted far and wide and stirred up as great a tempest as that in the Mediterranean Sea. But I never said what is charged against me, that if you throw the story of Jonah out of the Bible you throw God out of it. What I did say was that if you deny the story of Jonah and the whale you must deny the resurrection of Jesus Christ, because he said : "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." If you make the one to be a parable or a myth, I don't see how you can claim anything more for the other. And I believe the

great and overwhelming majority of the common people with their English Bible in their hands will stand with me in that judgment.

But my critics keep talking about the scholars, the great men who make a business of criticising the Bible, and who think differently from me. Well, all the scholars don't think differently by any means. There are lots of scholars on my side, or rather on the side of the old Bible. I suppose that Dr. Philip Schaff would be classed as a scholar, but he stands by the story of Jonah on the same ground that I do. So does Professor Townsend who has been connected with the Boston University for twenty-five years, and so does President Harper, of the Chicago University, who said at Northfield, in the presence of five or six hundred students: "I believe that the whale swallowed Jonah." Hundreds of the best and ablest preachers in this country and Great Britain stand on this question just where our fathers stood, and its present agitation is bringing their testimony to the front in a way that is strengthening faith in the Word of God.

But I shouldn't care so very much if scholars were not on my side. There's a false notion of authority associated with much that we hear in these days about the science of biblical criticism, as it is called. A man may have great knowledge of the languages and literature of the Bible; but does that prove that he has great judgment, or great spiritual sense in drawing conclusions from his knowledge? Are those words of Jesus Christ about Jonah correctly translated? Is there any doubt of the historical accuracy of that text? I am willing to listen to the science of biblical criticism on either of those questions, because it can teach me there. But do I, or does any one of average common sense, need its help after that? Can't we read our mother tongue, and aren't we as well able to form a judgment as to the sense of our Saviour's words in such a case as the most learned man on earth? Come, if we deny that, then we must go a step further and take the Bible away from the common people altogether. I believe there are a good many scholars in these days,

as there were when Paul lived, "who professing themselves to be wise, have become fools;" but I don't think they are those who hold to the inspiration and infallibility of the whole Bible.

I have said that ministers of the Gospel who are cutting up the Bible in this way, denying Moses to-day and Isaiah to-morrow, and Daniel the next day and Jonah the next, are doing the Devil's work; and I stand by what I have said. I don't say they are devils; I don't say they are bad men; they may be good men, but that makes the results of their work all the worse. Do they think they will recommend the Bible to the finite and fallen reason of men by taking the supernatural out of it? They are doing just the opposite to that. They are emptying their churches and driving the young men of this generation into infidelity. Here is an extract from the letter of a pastor that I received yesterday; it is only one of scores and even hundreds of the same kind that I am receiving right along, and it tells what this treatment of God's Word is doing for our land:

"DEAR MR. MOODY: This is one of the most wicked cities I know of, and we have the coldest, most worldly churches I have ever seen. I have labored and prayed for a revival and for the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and it seems to do but little good. Can't you come and help us, provided our ministers and churches will unite? . . . This is a Macedonian call if ever you had one."

I tell you, my friends, Christian ministers and laymen, the cause of this state of things is in neglecting and apologizing to the natural man for the Word of God. Hear Jehovah as he himself testifies of the work of such prophets, in Jeremiah 23:22:

"But if they had stood in my counsel, and had caused my people to hear my words, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings."

I pray God we may end controversy now, and go to work in earnest for souls. All over this country there are seekers after Christ, and we can't afford to lose time and strength in disputing about the sword of the Spirit. What we want to do is to thrust it into men in such a way that by the power of God it may slay the old and give life to the new nature in Christ Jesus.

THE STORY OF JONAH.<sup>1</sup>

From *The Outlook* (New York), February 6, 1897.

RECENT reports, on the one hand of a sermon of Dwight L. Moody, on the other of a sermon of Lyman Abbott, referring to the story of Jonah, have awakened a considerable degree of public interest on this subject. How absolutely false was the report of Dr. Abbott's sermon and its effect, given in one of New York's sensational journals and thence extensively copied throughout the country, our readers will find stated on another page of this issue; and we very much doubt the accuracy of the report that Mr. Moody in his sermon affirmed or implied that the rejection of the historical accuracy of the Jonah story was equivalent to a rejection of Christ, and that one could not be a Christian unless he accepted the Book of Jonah as historical. But probably the views of these two men may be taken as typical—the one of the opinion that the Jonah story is a history which depends for its value on its historical accuracy, the other that it is a satire, conceived in the spirit of Oriental imagination and depending for its value on the moral lesson of which it is a vehicle.

It ought not to be necessary to say that one view is as reverent as the other. One does not treat the parable of the trees in Judges, chapter ix., irreverently because he sees in it a satire on the political folly of the men of Shechem, which is as applicable to our time as to Jotham's; nor the picture of the descent of the King of Babylon into Hades irreverently because he reads in it a bitter sarcasm on the short-lived majesty of that monarch; nor the parable of the Prodigal Son irreverently because he thinks it a purely imaginary story conceived by Christ to illustrate the contrast between divine forgiveness and the Pharasaic spirit. As little is it lacking in reverence to see in the story of Jonah and the great fish a satire on the narrowness of certain

<sup>1</sup> For general comment, see "Current Thought."

Judaistic teachers of the second or third century before Christ, and an exposition, in contrast, of "the wideness of God's mercy, like the wideness of the sea." Nor is there anything in Scripture, except the structure of the book itself, to determine for the reverent student of the Bible which of these views he shall take. The only passage cited is the verse in Matthew: "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." The Pharisees had demanded of Christ a sign. According to both Matthew and Luke, he refused to give any sign; according to Luke, he added that "as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation." That his words stop here, and that the additional words in Matthew are a note added, possibly by Matthew, more probably by some early copyist, is reasonably believed, because (1) the Ninevites knew nothing, so far as the history indicates, of Jonah's sea experiences; it was at his *preaching*, as Christ himself elsewhere says, that they repented; (2) Christ was not three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, but one day and two nights; (3) and, finally, the very gist of Christ's reply, which was a refusal to give the Pharisees any sign, is set aside by the supposition that he promised them the greatest of all signs—his own resurrection. This sign was given later, but not to them; he appeared only to his own disciples. For these reasons we think, as many Biblical scholars think, that it is a mistake to quote the words given above as the words of Christ.

The reverent student of the Bible, then, may take the story of Jonah as he finds it in the Bible, and from the story itself, its form and structure and spirit, will draw his own conclusion upon this question whether it is history, dependent for its value on its historical accuracy, or a satirical fiction, dependent for its value on the lesson which it conveys. What is the story?

Jehovah tells a prophet to go proclaim to Nineveh its approaching doom. But the prophet does not believe in preaching to pagan peoples. He therefore

flees in the opposite direction, goes on board ship at Tarshish, and sets sail. Once out of Palestine he thinks himself out of the jurisdiction of Jehovah, goes down into his cabin, and goes to sleep. A storm arises. The captain summons him to come on deck and join his prayers to Jehovah with those of the despised heathen sailors to their gods ; for the captain does not doubt that it is because of the anger of the gods that the storm has come upon them. The prayers are un-availing ; the storm continues ; and it is determined to cast lots to decide whose fault has brought on this calamity. The lot falls to Jonah ; he confesses, and bids the sailors cast him into the sea ; thus Jehovah will be appeased, and the rest saved. The sailors are unwilling to comply ; row hard to bring the ship to land ; all is in vain ; and at last reluctantly these pagans cast the prophet overboard. The storm instantly ceases. A great fish which Jehovah has especially prepared swallows the prophet. He rejoices in the refuge thus providentially prepared, and composes in the belly of the great fish, not a prayer for escape, but a psalm of thanksgiving for the already vouchsafed deliverance. After three days and three nights the great fish vomits the prophet out on the dry land, and, taught by experience, he obeys the second call of Jehovah and goes to Nineveh. It is a three days' walk across the city, but Jonah has gone but one-third the distance, preached but one day, before the whole city repents, and king, peasant, and cattle are clothed in sack-cloth and begin a fast. The Lord withholds the threatened doom, and the still narrow-minded prophet is angry. Listen to his remonstrance : " O Jehovah, was not this my saying when I was yet in mine own country ? *Therefore* I fled before unto Tarshish *because* I knew that thou art a gracious God, and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repentest thee of the evil." Is there anywhere in literature, sacred or secular, ancient or modern, a keener satire of bigotry than this picture of a petulant prophet, angry because God is gracious to the heathen ? He goes out to sit beside the walls of the city, and watch what will become of it. Jehovah

prepares a broad-leafed gourd to shelter him, and the prophet is glad. He prepares a worm to destroy the shelter, and the prophet is angered again. To Jehovah's patient remonstrance, "Thou hast mercy on the gourd, and should not I have mercy on this great city?" he can offer no reply, and so the story ends, the prophet in his childish vexation still sitting outside the wall, unreconciled to God's goodness.

This is, in brief, the story of Jonah. Such scholars as Ewald and Driver regard it as fiction, not because of the miracle of the great fish. That is not a greater miracle than others, not so great as some. But, in the whole scope and spirit and structure of the story, this book reads to these scholars like a product, not merely of imagination, but of Oriental imagination, not merely like a satire, but almost like a caricature. Outside of ecclesiastical circles this story invariably produces a smile. Might not this suggest that it was intended by the author to produce a smile? that he wrote it to smite with ridicule that narrowness of spirit, that religious provincialism, which is more amenable to ridicule than to any other weapon? That a prophet of Jehovah should think to escape from his God by fleeing from the province of Palestine is the first point in this satire; that he who would not preach to pagans is compelled to mingle his prayer with pagans is a second satire; that pagan sailors should do their utmost to save a prophet of Jehovah from the consequence of his own misdoing is a third satire; that he should be angry with the Lord because the Lord is gracious to Nineveh is a fourth satire; that he should care for his gourd and himself, and not for Nineveh and its thousands of inhabitants, is a fifth satire. And over against this picture of ecclesiastical narrowness is set the portrayal of God—who saves the sailors, saves Jonah, saves Nineveh, and compels even this provincial prophet to declare of him that he is "a gracious God, and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repentest him of the evil." Thus, two thousand years or more before F. W. Faber, the nineteenth-century poet of the love of God, this unknown author of the one humorous

book in all Hebrew literature enforces, with a good-natured satire, the lesson which the more modern poet has expressed in the lines :

" But we make His love too narrow  
By false limits of our own,  
And we magnify His strictness  
With a zeal He will not own."

Whether this view of the story of Jonah is correct or not is open to question. But it is not unchristian, nor irreverent, nor inconsistent with a profound faith in the truth and inspiration of the Bible, and of this particular book in the Bible.

#### DR. ABBOTT AND THE BOOK OF JONAH.

So much sensational comment has been made in some of the newspapers on a sermon preached by the Rev. Lyman Abbott in Plymouth Church on Sunday evening, January 24, that, as Dr. Abbott is Editor-in-Chief of *The Outlook*, we depart from our usual custom of ignoring such personal matters and give our readers the facts in full. On the day after the delivery of the sermon in question—which was one of a connected series on the "Bible as Literature"—the following paragraph appeared in one of the metropolitan daily papers, and was widely telegraphed throughout the country :

Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott has been delivering a series of Sunday night lectures on the Bible at Plymouth Church, where Beecher once held sway. "Jonah and the Whale" was his subject to-night, and there was as much laughter and amusement over his remarks as if a variety performance was in progress. He started off by saying that the story of Jonah and the whale was a fiction, and that there was no obligation on any one to believe it. It was a parable on the same line as that of the "Prodigal Son."

Dr. Abbott had no doubt that a person named Jonah had once existed, but his adventures after being thrown from the ship had come to be regarded as the "Pickwick Paper" of the Bible.

Unrestrained laughter followed this and some other humorous references.

We should think it hardly necessary, if we had not received several letters of inquiry, to say that the above newspaper paragraph is either ignorant or malicious



misrepresentation. The subject of the sermon was not "Jonah and the Whale," but a survey of the Books of Jonah, Esther, and Daniel; nor was the sermon greeted with "unrestrained laughter;" nor did Dr. Abbott compare the Book of Jonah to the "Pickwick Papers." What he did say was that a well-known American Congregational clergyman, the Rev. Charles Caverno, had not inaptly described the satire of the Book of Jonah as being, in quality, like the satire of Lowell's "Biglow Papers." The congregation received the sermon, as it was given, in a reverent spirit.

Immediately following the publication of these sensational newspaper misstatements, the Manhattan Association of Brooklyn—a ministerial club of which Dr. Abbott is not a member—passed the following resolution:

In view of certain recent and current public utterances from a prominent Congregational pulpit in this city concerning the Bible, which are being widely disseminated by the press, we, the members of the Manhattan Association of Congregational Ministers, fearing lest our silence be accepted by the uninformed as an indorsement of these views, do declare our emphatic dissent from such handling of the Holy Scriptures, and deplore the probable effect of such teachings.

It is generally supposed that this resolution, while couched in somewhat veiled and indefinite language, refers to the series of sermons on "The Bible as Literature" now being preached in Plymouth Church by Dr. Abbott. In these sermons Dr. Abbott is giving to his evening congregations the same general view of the Bible presented last year to the readers of *The Outlook* in "The Bible as Literature" series and "The Bible and the Child" series by such writers as the Very Rev. F. W. Farrar, Rev. Robert F. Horton, the Very Rev. W. H. Fremantle, the Rev. Washington Gladden, D.D., Professor Richard G. Moulton, the Rev. A. B. Bruce, D.D., the Rev. Henry van Dyke, D.D., the Rev. William Elliott Griffis, D.D., Professor Albert P. Cook, and others. As the resolution does not state the respects in which those who voted for it dissent from these views of the Bible, it is impossible to pass any critical judgment upon their dissent, but it probably indicates that at least the gentlemen who advocated

the resolution of censure upon Dr. Abbott, including the Rev. Drs. A. J. F. Behrends, A. J. Lyman, Thomas B. McLeod, and R. R. Meredith, do not sympathize with the view of the date, authorship, and significance of the books of the Bible entertained by such scholars as Ewald and Wellhausen in Germany ; Driver, Cheyne, Robertson Smith, Dean Stanley, and Dean Farrar in England ; Professor Briggs, of Union ; Professor Moore, of Andover ; Professor Schmidt, of Cornell ; Professor Bacon, of Yale ; and Professor Henry P. Smith, late of Lane Seminary, in this country. Or else they do not think such views, even if correct, should be given to the laity in popular discourse.

We are glad to add that the episode has been most happily and generously closed by the following considerate and courteous letter from Dr. Behrends, which we clip from the *Brooklyn Eagle*. Such a letter is a cheering demonstration of the truth that a real and definite difference of theological opinion between Christian gentlemen does not destroy their spirit of brotherhood :

*To the Editor of the Brooklyn Eagle :*

It often happens, in the rush of unpremeditated speech, that sentences fall from one's lips which wear a very different face when they appear in cold type. Such a sentence I find credited to me in the *Eagle's* reports of my remarks at the meeting of the Manhattan Association, reflecting somewhat rudely and offensively upon the ability and scholarship of Dr. Abbott. I cannot permit myself to pass it over in silence, for it savors of an arrogance which I should despise myself in cherishing. I cannot claim to have been incorrectly reported ; but the words meant much more than I intended to convey, and they were certainly not uttered in any spirit either of bitterness or of depreciation. I simply wish, in this public manner, to withdraw them, as unwarranted and uncalled for, and as conveying an unfriendly judgment which I did not intend, and which Dr. Abbott certainly did not, and does not, deserve. And I do this promptly, before any criticism for lack of courtesy can lessen the force of this free and frank apology.

A. J. F. BEHREND'S.

BROOKLYN, January 28, 1897.

## THE ESSENTIAL PROTESTANTISM OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. HENRY WACE, D.D., VICAR OF ST. MICHAEL'S, CORNHILL, LATE PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

From *The Rock* (London), February 5, 1897.

FROM the commencement of the reforming movement by Luther to the close of the sixteenth century, a succession of statements was put forth by the various communions engaged in the struggle, declaring the position they held on the great questions in dispute. There is one mediæval custom in respect to which more continuity with those times might with advantage be cultivated. The systematic habit of disputation had accustomed men to state in plain propositions the views they maintained, and their opponents were expected to do the same. Luther began with a series of very definite theses or propositions, which he offered to maintain against all comers, and he was answered by the advocates of the existing system in similar propositions. Accordingly, when the reforming party were brought face to face with the existing authorities in the Diet of Augsburg, they were expected to state, in a series of plain propositions, what were the points for which they were contending; and they therefore presented a Confession stating a number of Articles, or particulars, of their belief. They thought it wise to declare, in the first place, their acceptance of the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith; and then they proceeded to state the Articles or points on which they desired the reformation of doctrine or practice. These latter points naturally formed the most characteristic parts of the Confession, and marked out the distinctive principles which its authors asserted. From that time forward the great struggle between the Papacy and the Reformation, between Romanism and Protestant-

<sup>1</sup> From the verbatim report of Dr. Wace's Islington Clerical Meeting address which appeared in the *Record*.

ism, went forward, until it divided every country in Europe; and it produced a series of Confessions of faith all having the general object of the Augsburg Confession—that of declaring the position which its authors took up in the great religious struggle of the day.

In particular, both in Germany and in England, Articles followed Articles. In our own country we had the Ten Articles of 1536, the Six Articles of 1539, the Forty-two Articles of 1552, and eventually the Thirty-nine Articles of 1571. The Church of Rome herself had felt it necessary to follow the general course, and in the Synod of Trent, between the years 1545 and 1563, she produced a series of decrees and canons which stated, in equally definite Articles, the positions she held on the great questions in dispute. Now these simple facts are enough to illustrate that the Articles of Religion adopted by the Church of England, agreed upon by the clergy of the Church of England in Convocation, and sanctioned by the lawful authority, must be taken as the special and characteristic declaration of the position of the Church of England in respect to the grand controversy of the sixteenth century. As the Augsburg Confession is the authoritative declaration of the teaching of the Lutheran Church; as the Westminster Confession is that of the Scottish Church; as the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent, supplemented by those of the Vatican Council, are the authorized and characteristic declaration of the teaching of the Roman Church, so the Thirty-nine Articles are the authoritative and characteristic declaration of the teaching of the Church of England. All other teaching in other Churches is brought to the standard of their particular Confessions. The Missal and the Breviary are not the standards by which the Council of Trent is interpreted; but the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent determine the grounds on which the Missal and the Breviary are to be defended, and the spirit in which they are to be used. In each case it is the Articles, the formal statements agreed upon by the clergy, and sanctioned by the required

authorities, which are the standard of doctrine. In doubtful points, therefore, in points by which we are marked off from other Communions, it is to the Articles that we must look for guidance, and it is by our Articles that we must be judged. If we want to know the mind of the Church of England, we must study the Articles; if we wish to act in accordance with that mind we must be imbued with their spirit and teach in accordance with it.

What is that spirit? Here, again, we are on the ground of sure and unquestionable facts. The Thirty-nine Articles are, beyond all question, a Protestant Confession. They definitely place the Church of England on the side of the great reforming movement of the sixteenth century. They are, in some quarters, disliked for this reason, and the very dislike is a strong testimony to the fact. Their very language is often drawn, on crucial points, from foreign Protestant Confessions; from the Confessions, for instance, of Augsburg and Württemberg; and they declare themselves, in the strongest manner, against the chief points of Roman doctrine and practice, which the Protestant Reformers had denounced. An attempt has been made in our time, and is made still, to represent them as directed mainly against certain popular abuses, and not against the formal teaching of the Church of Rome. One or two simple, but important, facts seem sufficient to refute this suggestion. The Forty-two Articles, with which our present Thirty-nine Articles are, in the main, identical, were issued in 1552. As I have reminded you, the Council of Trent began its sessions in 1545. Historically, therefore, the Articles were drawn up and published in the face of the chief Articles of the great Tridentine Confession; and it is not conceivable that, in dealing with Roman doctrine and practice, their authors would leave on one side the express and authoritative statements of the Roman authorities.

But one particular point, of the greatest consequence to the whole argument, seems of peculiar interest in this matter. The Thirty-nine Articles are distinguished in one very important particular from previous Prot-

estant Confessions. The Augsburg Confession, after the Article on God and the Persons of the Blessed Trinity, goes on immediately to the doctrines of Original Sin, the Incarnation, and Justification; and the Württemberg Confession subsequently follows this order. But in the Forty-two Articles, and in the Thirty-nine Articles, immediately after what may be called the Articles of the Creed, comes the Sixth Article, "Of the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture," and not until after that Article do they proceed to the Articles on Original Sin, on Justification, and the other points of the controversy.

What was there to occasion the introduction of this Article on Holy Scripture at this point in the Forty-two Articles? The reason may be discerned, if we bear in mind that the Council of Trent began its sittings in 1545, and that immediately after its preliminary Confession of Faith, which was adopted, in its third Session, on February 4th, 1546, it proceeded immediately in its fourth Session, on April 8th in that year, to its famous decree, "Concerning the Canonical Scriptures," in which it laid down the principle that the unwritten traditions, proceeding from our Lord or from the Apostles—unwritten, that is, in the Sacred Scriptures—were to be received with equal piety and reverence with the Holy Scriptures themselves. That was a new thing in the controversy. The Reformers, abroad and at home, had had to contend indeed against the undue weight allowed to traditions, but it had not previously been made the formal rule of faith, as well as of practice, that the unwritten traditions of the Church should be accepted as of equal authority with the Scriptures on the points in dispute. Doubtless the Roman divines took this course because they had no other open to them. If they had allowed the controversy between themselves and the Reformers to be conducted on the basis of the Holy Scriptures alone, they must have been defeated, and consequently, with a true instinct for the weak point of their position, they asserted, as the basis of all their subsequent proceed-

ings, the insufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, as the rule of faith. Accordingly, when our Reformers put their Article, respecting the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, in the forefront of their Confession, immediately after the Articles of the Creed, they were meeting the Council of Trent directly and face to face. They took up the challenge conveyed to them, not in popular misapprehensions and unauthorized practices, but in the formal and authoritative decision of the Council of Trent, then sitting; and they laid the foundation of all their subsequent Articles in a flat denial of the first and cardinal principle which the Roman divines asserted. There could hardly be a case of more direct contradiction of what had been made by that Council the primary principle, the *ratio decidendi*, in the controversies then in question. The principle of our Articles throughout was thus that on which Luther took his stand; and, as Bishop Marsh says in his "Comparative View" of the two Churches, it is "the vital principle of the Reformation." By that single act our Church formally took her stand on the Protestant side; and as the subsequent Roman decisions flow naturally from their admission of unwritten traditions as of Divine authority, so all the rest of our Articles, in opposition to those decisions, flow naturally from our rejection of the authority of those traditions.

But this assertion of the sole and paramount authority of Holy Scripture in controversies of faith is not merely of cardinal importance in the controversy; it indicates the whole character of the position which our Church assumes. It indicates, as I have said, that the Church of England is a Protestant Church. What is the meaning of that designation? . . . Its original meaning was positive, not negative. It was first used of those who were called Protestants in the Diet of Spiers, because they asserted that men were bound in conscience to follow the Word of God, no matter what human authority might be against them, and that no majority had a right to force consciences. The essential and positive meaning of the word "Protestant,"

therefore, is embodied in our Sixth Article. When we call ourselves Protestant, when we proclaim that the Church of England is a Protestant Church, we are protesting that the Word of God—the word of the prophets of the Old Testament, the Word of Christ and His Apostles—is the one rule, the one supreme authority, which we recognize, and that we make it the main object of our lives, in private, in public, and in all Church affairs, to apprehend the truth, and to realize the ideals, which that Word sets before us. We recognize, indeed, that the best realization which that Word has ever received in the Christian ages was exhibited in the Primitive Church, and we therefore look to that Church as a guide, which we hope never to desert in any important point of the interpretation of the Word of God. But, as Dr. Hawkins, of Oriel, said in his Bampton Lectures of 1840 :—

“ We are constrained to disallow the claim of Infallibility and Absolute Authority, whether advanced on behalf of any particular Church, or of the Church Universal, or of the Ancient Church in the period of her comparative unity, as well as of the Modern Church in her state of sad disunion ; yielding indeed, in the words of Dr. Jackson, “ a conditional assent and a cautionary obedience,” wherever it is justly due, but never in any case conceding, except to the original messengers of revealed truth, absolute assent and unlimited obedience.”

That is the positive ideal of a Reformed and Protestant Church. We do not look for our ideals to the historical development of Christian history, either in the West or in the East. . . . The Church of England, in a word, is Protestant, not in the sense of being either Lutheran or Calvinistic, although she is in the main on the side of those great influences, as against the Roman Catholic influence. Nor is she, as is sometimes charged against her, a Church of compromise. That is the vulgar reproach too often thrown against the noblest characteristic of the English mind—its firmness and boldness in recognizing truth wherever it may be found, and refusing to shut its eyes, in the spirit of a partisan, to any portions of truth on one side or the other. But the Church of England is herself ; and herself is first Scriptural, and then Primitive. The



ideal which she pursues is a Catholic ideal because it is an Apostolic one, and it is this Catholic and Apostolic ideal which she understands by the word "Protestant," and which she will make her guiding star.

## CURRENT THOUGHT.

### Jonah and the Whale.

**TOO FUNNY TO BELIEVE.**—The Book of Jonah is regarded as fiction by Dr. Lyman Abbott, pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. In a recent sermon he declared it a matter of no concern whatever spiritually whether a great fish swallowed Jonah or not. "No man is worse for not believing that; no man is better for believing it. Nothing whatever in your life or mine depends upon the opinions which we entertain upon that subject." As reported, the preacher subsequently told the story of Jonah in simple language. When he described how Jonah composed a psalm while in the belly of the great fish, there was a burst of laughter. Dr. Abbott did not notice it at the time, but as he was concluding his sermon, he said: "This is the story. I have tried to tell it as simply as I could. I am sorry that you laughed when I spoke of Jonah composing a psalm in the belly of the fish. I do not wish to raise a laugh respecting any statement in the Hebrew Scriptures or in the Scriptures of any religion. Nevertheless, I cannot but think that the fact that that statement caused amusement shows the incongruity which lies in the very nature of the narrative."

The preacher is in error. The incongruity is not in the story, but rather in the fact that a minister of the Gospel of the Lord

Jesus Christ should make fun of an event to which Christ set His seal as the type of His own death and resurrection. A man may have a great faculty for seeing the humorous side of a story, and yet hear that of Jonah without finding a muscle of his face quiver. Reverently read, the account is wonderfully impressive, and by no means mirth-provoking. It was the preacher's funny narration that moved his hearers to hilarious merriment. Dr. Abbott's claim that the merriment thus evoked shows the incongruity of the story is by no means a logical one. Noah prophesied the flood long years before it came. The seeming incongruity of the prediction no doubt made men laugh. But the flood came, incongruous as it was. Christ says that the end of the age will come in just such a sudden and unexpected manner. The seeming incongruity of the interruption to human wantonness and sin, to the world's pleasure and commerce leads men to deem it impossible. But incongruity does not prove impossibility.

A notorious blasphemer lectures on the "mistakes" of Moses. Only another word for incongruities. His audience laughs at the Bible stories as he tells them. According to Dr. Abbott that ribald laughter proves the stories incongruous in their nature. The infidel's blasphemous allusions to the Trinity have evoked roars of merriment. Ap-

plying the logic of Plymouth pulpit, the incongruity of the evangelical view of a triune God is shown by the laughter it induces.

Men who indulge in sin and folly, who live to the flesh and not to God, when brought face to face with God's word, often relieve their consciences by caricaturing the stories and teachings of Old and New Testaments. The fall, the incarnation, the resurrection, the final judgment, future retribution, and many other doctrines, are incongruous from a materialistic point of view, but this measure of incongruity does not prove them untrue. Fools split their sides over witty caricatures of truth, and fools have been known to give up Jesus as well as Jonah, induced thereto by the preaching of rationalistic ministers. If the Bible abounds in fiction as well as fact, who shall decide for us which is which? Who shall sift the wheat from the chaff? We have a suggestion. Let the pastor of Plymouth tell all the Bible stories in his own way, and every story that is received with laughter by his hearers shall be accounted incongruous and false, or at best but pleasant fiction. The stories that pass unnoticed, that have no Mother Goose flavor about them, over which the funniest man in all Plymouth Church fails even to smile, shall be laid aside as wheat. That other ministers of Dr. Abbott's denomination are not prepared for such a process is shown by the resolution which the Manhattan Congregational Association passed last week.

One question will not down in all this discussion. Tersely stated, it is this: How far is it from Jonah to Jesus? If we believe not Jonah, how long shall we believe Jesus? If the resurrection of Jonah goes by the board as fic-

tion, how about the resurrection of the Lord Jesus when our Lord Himself indissolubly links the one to the other as type and antitype? Rejecting the only sign given, is it likely that faith in the event signified will long remain?—*The Observer*, N. Y. (Pres.).

ANOTHER attack has been made upon Jonah and the Whale and in the pulpit. The preacher's ridicule of the story was so witty, we are told by the newspaper report, that "guffaws of laughter shook the building." Then the preacher expressed regret that what he had said should have caused laughter, for he only meant to teach that the story was not fact but parable.

Well, let it be admitted that the sermon was intended for something better than it seemed to those who heard it, for the press report is that its purpose seemed to the greater part of the audience to be that of ridicule; the very fact that it produced an impression which the preacher regretted should be a warning not only to himself but to the whole class of men who are assailing the Old Testament. That they do not seemingly know that their weapons are loaded is one of the worst features of this dangerous business. Men who pose as scholars and guides of progress should not be as foolishly ignorant of the real character of their utterances as children are of the danger of a loaded pistol. If they do not themselves know just what they are doing, these men who guffaw at their sallies know exactly what they are doing, and so does the public.

Then again, take the preacher's own view of the story, that it is a parable, and as a parable what should it teach him? First, that ministers are sometimes seized

with a strong desire to escape the unpleasant duty of facing the inhabitants of a wicked city with a stern message against their sins and a denunciation of impending wrath. It is easier to dodge off to some other kind of preaching than to face wealth, fashion, power and luxury with a call to repentance. In these days of criticism of everything from Moses to Malachi, it requires no moral courage to slash into Jonah and the Whale, but it does require more old-fashioned grit to stand up against the real sins of the day than four out of five of these critics are showing. If this class of preachers want to learn a salutary lesson from their so-called parable they will let up on the Old Testament and try their hand on the sinful world around them.

In the next place, these ministers who keep denominations stirred up by attacks on things believed may learn a parabolic lesson from the story on methods of keeping the peace. When the sailors threw Jonah overboard the storm ceased and they got on to their destination.

The men who are seriously and earnestly engaged in the work of calling sinners to repentance and saving the lost make no trouble for the denomination. But those who are constantly breaking out against its beliefs, first on one side and then on the other, keep it in troubled waters all the time. The denomination no sooner gets its face well set toward some great missionary enterprise or forward movement than somebody raises a breeze over future probation, inspiration or something else, and then we are in a stormy sea again. If the denomination is to get on at the front it must have more rest in the rear. The men who want to go to Joppa should not take ship with a church which

is going out to save the lost Ninevehs of the world.

Still another lesson: Jonah was made better by being swallowed by the whale. Short rations and dismal surroundings for three days and nights worked a radical change in his feelings and purpose. There are men in the ministry who would be much more benefited by three days and nights in the cavern of a whale than by three years in a theological school where criticism is standing diet. Too much criticism is a sign of too large a sense of independence, of self-sufficiency. Such an overgrowth of self assertion would no doubt be materially reduced by an experience similar to that of Jonah.—*The Advance*, Chicago (Cong.).

SPEAKING on the subject in Plymouth Church, Dr. Abbott's remarks were in a jocular vein, which caused merriment among his audience, with the result that he has been called to task sharply by other ministers of the Congregational Church as false to his professed religious convictions.

We said and we now repeat that the accusation was well founded, and that Dr. Abbott is really an infidel while professing to hold and to preach the Christian faith. Our objecting correspondents contend that belief in Christ does not require faith in His supernatural origin, or His divinity, but may consist simply in the acceptance of his doctrines. As one of them expresses it, "there is no reason why the doctor or any one else may not reject the supernatural, reject the idea of the infallibility of the Bible, and still be a Christian."

Such a man may be a Christian as he may be a Spencerian if he agrees with the philosophy of

Herbert Spencer ; but he is not a Christian in the sense of the religious belief in Jesus Christ, which is required of a man in order that he may obtain ordination in a Congregational church. A declaration of faith adopted by Congregationalists in 1865 expresses their belief as still held with regard to the divinity of Christ :

"We confess our faith in God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the only living and true God ; in Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word, who is exalted to be our Redeemer and King ; and in the Holy Comforter, who is present in the Church to regenerate and sanctify the soul."

That is the religious belief in Christ which Dr. Abbott and his defenders reject ; and hence they are infidels. They deny the Christian faith. Whether they have reason for so doing is not the question. In denying the supernatural origin and authority of Jesus as the "incarnate Word," they reject the essential and fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith. If they agree with the teachings of Jesus, and accept them as merely human utterances, and only so far as this agreement goes, on the ground that "the truth of the Master needs no supernatural proof to-day," their belief is no more religious faith than if they accept any other human philosophy. They are not Christians in the sense of the Congregational declaration from which we have quoted above.

Belief in Jesus in that sense necessarily implies belief in the infallibility of the Bible and in the miracles recorded therein. Revelation itself can come only by a miracle. It must be supernatural in its source. Man can know of the ways of God only by

revelation, for they are past finding out by any human investigation. The knowledge of them must be derived, if it is derived at all, from supernatural and infallible authority alone. The greatest of all miracles is the Incarnation, upon which depends the whole faith of orthodox Christendom. The Resurrection was a miracle defying the laws of nature as science knows them ; and the authority for it rests solely in the infallibility of the Scriptures.

Moreover, this very miracle of Jonah and the whale, the biblical account of which was treated so comically by Dr. Abbott, was specifically confirmed by Jesus Himself, and referred to as shadowing forth the Resurrection. Here are His words in the twelfth chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew : "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

It will be seen, therefore, that Dr. Abbott's offence against the Christian faith, in making sport of this particular miracle, was peculiarly flagrant. Why, too, is there any more reason for refusing to believe the story of Jonah's experience with the whale, which we elsewhere copy from the Bible, than for rejecting any other of the miraculous occurrences described in the Scriptures, and upon which the whole Christian faith rests ? If one falls because it is impossible under natural law, all the rest must fall with it.

Consequently the Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott, pastor of Plymouth Church in Brooklyn, is incontestably an unbeliever ; in other words, an infidel. He does not believe in the Bible, and not believing in the Bible, he cannot believe in the Christian religion. —*The Sun, New York.*

## LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

CONDUCTED BY REV. CHARLES R. GILLETT, LIBRARIAN OF UNION  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION. By ROBERT L. OTTLEY, M.A., Fellow of S. M. Magdalen College, and Principal of Pusey House, Oxford. Vol. I. To the Council of Nicæa. II. To the Present Day. 2 vols., 8vo. Pp. xii., 324; x., 366. London: Methuen & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1896. \$3.50.

This conscientious, reverent, and admirable work deserves much more than a passing notice. For its own sake, as a fair, clear, truthful, and able statement of the thought of the church upon the essential fact of Christianity, it merits and will repay the closest study and reflection. But it has a much wider interest in the fact that it does not stand alone, but is part of a religious movement which far beyond all others of our time needs to be rightly understood and wisely dealt with. Let us take some pains then to see: (1) What the book is in itself; (2) what is the general condition of religious thought that has produced it; and (3) what particular tendency in that thought it represents.

I. With regard to the work itself and our estimate of it, we may say that, although it was for us a much and but recently trodden path, we have traversed anew with this author, and with a new and unflagging interest, every step of the long and intricate story of Christological doctrine—prophetic, Messianic, scriptural, patristic, conciliar, scholastic, reformed, Anglican, and contemporaneous. At an unfavorable moment, when we thought it impossible to revive a much-wearied interest in the subject, we have read with unflinching attention and sympathy every word of these two large volumes. And the result is that we do not hesitate to pronounce this to be, on the whole, the most readable, reliable, and comprehensible historical

statement of the Catholic doctrine of the Person of Christ in the reach of English students. When so very much ground is covered, it is not practicable to comment or criticise in detail. We will only say now that, while in the scriptural part we do not invariably assent to our author's exegesis, nor in the doctrinal part sympathize with his precise point of view, in the historical part, which is by far the largest, we find almost no occasion at all for dissent. The exposition, analysis, and criticism of the successive and varied phases of truth and error, the portraiture of individual thinkers, the characterization of systems and tendencies—are all sympathetic, truthful, and exact. The sketches are just full enough and long enough; the issues definitely, distinctly, and fairly drawn; the impression produced animated, vivid, and accurate. In fine, in this most essential respect, we presume there will be no difference of opinion among those who hold that there is a Catholic doctrine and a Catholic history of it.

II. But there is that in the time which renders it impossible that any living work on Christology should be only historical or expository. There are those, we know—and we are willing to concede that they are largely those who are living our Christianity, and are most competent to know how much of the new thought comes from lack of the old life of it—who hold that the whole subject of the Incarnation is a *res adjudicata*; that any Christology which is not a mere record or exposition of past thought is the presumptuous opening of a closed question. To these it is an offence and a grief that even in so conservative and reverent a work as this there should be an element of criticism of the past, a recognition of something still to be thought and said on the sacred subject, of something even to be added; not, indeed, to the faith, but to our better understanding and truer and fuller possession of the faith. The excuse for this is, of course, the fact that by far the greater part—to them it seems all—of the re-examination and discussion to which the sacred doctrine of the Divine Incarnation is reopened and ruthlessly exposed is avowedly hostile and destructive.

How much of it, indeed, looks forward complacently and confidently to the final stripping from our Lord of all that is Divine in His Person and all that is truly saving in His work! Nevertheless, there are even among the faithful some as faithful as any—as scriptural, as Catholic, and as Christian—who conscientiously believe that the true defence of the Church against modern critical—yes, even naturalistic and rationalistic—thought is, first of all, to see and admit what there is of truth in it; and, secondly, no less, what there is in itself of error, of unnatural and irrational admixture, foreign from its true essence and the accretion through long ages of uncritical ecclesiastical speculation. Full of risk as this course unquestionably is, and much as it exposes them to the charge of fighting in the ranks of the enemy, there are devout thinkers and loyal Churchmen who prefer it to what seems to them the foolish and suicidal one of simply shutting the eyes to all that is new, and blindly clinging to that which is old. Such a school as this is that to which we must assign Mr. Ottley, although he is a most conservative and cautious member of it. There are others that go much farther than he, and who are therefore more in danger of going too far, but it is foolish and wicked to divide the ranks and weaken the army of the Lord by denouncing those men as unscriptural, uncatholic, or essentially unchristian. The particular school of which we speak is none of these. In the first place, they hold what they hold because they believe that it is the truth of Scripture, and that what they are charged with surrendering is an *à priori*, speculative, reading into Scripture what is not there, a dogmatic, ecclesiastical Scripture which is not the true historical Scriptures. In the second place, they are the firmest believers in Catholic thought and in its result in Catholic truth. And here let us say that Catholic truth is not the truth as it is in itself, or as it is in the Scriptures, but as it has been interpreted and expressed by the life and thought of the Church. These writers believe not only in the truth and in the Scriptures, but in the Church's interpretation and ex-



pression of the truth and the Scriptures as embodied in Catholic consent. Their whole protest is against that which is not, their whole contention for that which is truly Catholic. The truth is one, and the mind of the Church, to be its expression, must be one also ; and whatever is in it, and contradicts or is inconsistent with it, cannot be truly of it. They want the organic completeness and unity and purity of Catholic truth. And they accept the Church's authority for this. They acknowledge in the decrees of the Catholic councils and the consent of the Catholic Church a body of dogma which is, reasonably and naturally, as well as spiritually and divinely, final and authoritative. They plead guilty to rejecting nothing in this but what does not belong to it, what seeming to be in cannot be truly of it, because it contradicts it. In the third place, this school of thought is profoundly theistic, religious, and Christian. Because it opens its mind to criticism, because it listens to reason and weighs the claims of nature, it does not follow that it therefore must or does any the more surrender God, the personal and present God, in the world, in Jesus Christ, or in the Church. Why should it? It is the friend of nature and reason as well as grace, because in its heart it believes that all these are one ; that incarnation, atonement, redemption, resurrection, and eternal life are as much the ultimate ends of nature and reason as they are the more immediate ones of grace.

Indeed, it is faith in the faith, and not disloyalty to it, which disposes the true believer to be willing to listen to every questioning or criticism of it from any quarter, and to render to every inquirer a reason for it in the terms of his inquiry. It is the characteristic of truth that it is translatable into all languages and equally true in all spheres. The Incarnation is so true, that it is true not only in words of Scripture and definitions of councils, but in the language of nature and in terms of universal human reason ; and it is not irreverence, but the confidence of a Divine faith that seeks to harmonize all our imperfect views and expressions of it. The simple Divine and human facts of the



Apostles' Creed were susceptible of translation into the scientific thought and language of the period of the councils ; and so far as the science and philosophy of to-day are true, Christianity is true in terms of them. We believe, indeed, that the Incarnation is the truth within all truth ; and therefore we believe that its Divine naturalness and humanness and reasonableness will at last convince all minds, and win all hearts, and convince all reasons, and subdue all wills, and sanctify and glorify all lives. We have so much faith in the truth of Christ that we are not overmuch afraid even of our own mistakes in reference to it. We have no such dread of the love of the Father, the grace of the Son, and the fellowship of the Spirit as to deter us from boldly striving to know ever more and more of them, even at the risk of possible and even probable occasional error. We know that we are in Him that is true ; and the truth makes us not only free, but fearless.

But at present our claim is not so wide as the above reflections would indicate. We have a narrower and more definite aim. We plead for the present reopening of Christological study and discussion on the ground that, not the Church's truth of the Incarnation, but the doctrine or interpretation of the Incarnation now dominant in the Church is, in some of its details, incomplete and inconsistent. On the principle that nothing is ever settled until it is settled rightly, we claim that there is reason for the present unsettled condition of Christian faith and life, and that the effect will not be remedied until the cause is removed.

III. We have assumed that in the volumes before us, scriptural, catholic, and conservative as they are, there is and could not but be something of the spirit of demand for renewed Christological inquiry. An observant reader will detect this spirit present and alert all through the volumes, and manifesting itself in the critical and not merely expository attitude maintained toward the successive thinkers and systems of doctrine. The author accepts, of course, *ex animo*, the Catholic mind of the Church as evolved, or evol-

ing, in the Catholic councils. But he does not hold that Athanasius, or Cyril, or Leo, or John Damascene, or Alcuin, or Aquinas was complete in his Christology or represented infallibly in his personal doctrine the mind of the Church as it was then and was to remain forever. He does not hold that the mind of the Church itself was at that stage so fully and finally formed as that there might not be still limitations, inconsistencies, and even errors in the thought of those who had contributed most to its formation. On the contrary, he sees contradictions in every one of them, and sympathetically, but conscientiously exposes them.

But it is in the tenth and last part of the work, in which the author himself states for us "the first systematic form of the doctrine of the Incarnation," that we may best study his own mental attitude. In the first two sections of this part we have an analysis and exposition of the terminology of the two great doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. This is extremely well done, and will be gratefully accepted by all parties. The third section treats of our Lord's humanity, the fourth and last of His work in connection with His Person. These two sections require our special attention.

The reality and completeness of our Lord's humanity was from the beginning a cardinal principle of Catholic doctrine. This was a matter of course, and there was nothing lacking in the expression of the fact that He was *ἀλήθως καὶ τελέως ἄνθρωπος*. There never has been any controversy as regards the doctrine; it comes only when we come to construe the doctrine and to carry it out in detail. Just now the discussion turns chiefly upon the point of the nature and limitations of our Lord's human consciousness and knowledge. Our author holds, of course, the full truth of the *προκοπή*, the natural growth or development of Jesus "in the powers not only of body, but also of mind and intellect." His general position will be judged by the following passage (p. 299, Vol. II.): "The insight and foresight vouchsafed to our Lord's

human spirit seems, in fact, to be analogous to that exercised by prophets and apostles. The indwelling presence of Deity does not altogether annihilate the action of human faculties, but intensifies and heightens it. The fulness of the Divine Spirit which sustained and illuminated our Lord's human faculties does not appear to have involved a Divine Omniscience, nor to have suspended altogether the ordinary laws and limitations of human intelligence." Upon this point we venture to go a little ahead of our author, and of the cautious and reverent feeling-of-the-way that characterizes this whole school of thought, and to say what seems to us to be going to be the mind of the Church when it has thought out to their consequences its own necessary principles. It is with us simply a question of what is contained in and must grow out of the seed-truth of the union of very Deity with very humanity in the Person of our Lord. On the side of the divinity there is practically nothing further to be said. Above and before all things, the Incarnation is throughout an act of God—an act wrought by Him in humanity, whereby it is made one with Him, free from sin, and partaker of eternal life. The most human life of Jesus Christ not only may, but must be thought as that of the Divine Word of whom He is the Incarnation. It is the infinite truth that in Him God was born, suffered, and died for us. Moreover, in the so-called *kenosis* it is not to be thought that the Divine Word ceased for a moment to be Himself, or became less than Himself, or divested Himself of any single faculty or function of Himself. The Logos could not cease to be omnipresent and omnipotent and omniscient. In the bosom of the Father and in the order of the universe His essential functions could not be interrupted. He was in Christ and He was Christ, but He was still the Logos of God and of creation. If for any moment He was not all His Divine self, during that moment His humanity was no true Incarnation. Nothing that Athanasius has felt or Cyril has said on that side of the truth can be too strong. But, looking at the Incarnation from the other side, we cannot say that Jesus

Christ, in the womb, or in infancy, or in maturest manhood, was omnipresent or omniscient ; or that He was consciously, with a human consciousness of the fact, sustaining the worlds and revealing the eternal Father to Himself. The Word as God was doing these things, but as man He was not ; and the historical Jesus was God as man and not as God. He was very man not alone in body, but in mind and soul and spirit, and in all the functions of all these. His human faculties were united with God and filled with God, but they did not cease to be human and become Divine. He was man not only ἀλήθως and τελείως, truly and completely, but ἀτρέπτως and ἀσυγχύτως, without conversion of one nature into the other or confusion of the two natures. The two distinct modes of consciousness, will, and activity which the Church assigns to the two natures are to be found respectively in the two natures—one in the Divine and the other in the human, not both in either. What we criticise in St. Leo—*e.g.*, is that he places both in the human. Not only with him, but with very many theologians, before, since, and now, the human Jesus possesses and alternates between a divine and a human mode of knowledge and action. He is speaking and acting in the Gospels now as God, now as man ; which is either partial conversion or total confusion. We contend that the Catholic doctrine of the humanity of our Lord consistently carried out requires us to believe that within His humanity our Lord was consistently human. He was not only "born of a woman," but born "under the law"—*i.e.*, born under the essential conditions and limitations of the nature in which He was born. In the union of an unlimited nature with a limited one, the former, of course, wholly includes the latter, but the latter does not wholly include the former. All the human life, experiences, and acts of Jesus, therefore, were those of the Divine Word incarnate in Him, but we cannot say that all the attributes, powers, and activities of the Logos were possessed and exercised by Jesus. It was the end and meaning of the Incarnation

that God should become man, in order that as man, under man's conditions, with man's mind and heart and will, He should accomplish man's part and become his redemption and completion. As human holiness, righteousness, and life, He was God, indeed, because only God is or can become those things in us ; but He is God in a specifically human or limited mind, will, activity, and life. All this does not mean that the human and historical Jesus was not filled with a Divine knowledge and grace, that He was not the wisdom of God and power of God, realized and manifested in human life by a human victory over sin and a human resurrection from death. From one point of view this is wholly an act of the Divine grace fulfilling itself in humanity and humanity in itself. From the opposite point of view it is equally an act of human self-renunciation and faith, losing itself and finding itself, dying to sin and living to God. The Incarnation must, of necessity, be as much an act of humanity as an act in humanity. As the latter it is the work of the Divine Word, as the former it is the work of the human Jesus. These two are one, but they are one in two *μορφαί*, or forms or modes of being and acting which are distinct, and must neither be confused together nor converted one into the other. We admit that there are, for us, inexplicable difficulties in this explanation, too, of the dual consciousness, will, and operation of the One Person of our Lord. But we submit that it is more true to Scripture, to Catholic principle, and to the fact of the Incarnation than that of St. Leo or of the present school of anti-kenotic theologians.

The true, complete, and distinct humanity of our Lord is not only an essential element of the Church's doctrine, it is even more vital, an element in the Church's life. If Jesus Christ be not what we are *as* we are, He is not ours ; He is not the Lord *our* righteousness ; He is not to us the way, the truth, and the life. We want in Him not only God in man, but man in God—the human way to God, human at-one-ment with God, human victory and peace and rest in God. We want to find in Him our own true selves, our hu-

man redemption and consummation, and eternal and perfect activity and life. In the fourth section of the tenth part of our work we not only go somewhat ahead of our author, but for the first time are in danger of parting company with him. In his treatment of the significance and effect of the atonement he seems to us to have less completely emancipated himself from the scholastic and later soteriology. We confess to a sympathy with what he calls the general view of the earlier Christian writers (p. 183, Vol. II.). In a less crude form than Irenæus we hold that the work of Christ was to destroy the works of the devil, and make us—first in His own person—sons of God and heirs of eternal life. He is to us the Woman's Seed who crushed the serpent's head, the divinely human conqueror and destroyer of sin and death. It was a part of the docetic one-sidedness of theology to make the atonement too much an act of God for, instead of, and really outside of man, and too little a Divine act in man, and so also of man, an act wherein humanity, too, by the grace of God in it died to self and lived to God. The Anselmic and later soteriologies make the atonement too much a judicial expunging of *guilt* by a substitution of God instead of man, and too little an actual taking away of *sin* by the union of God with man, whereby the latter is enabled by the Eternal Spirit to offer himself without spot to God. In the primitive promise it was the Woman's Seed that was to bruise the serpent's head. Humanity was to undo what humanity had done. In fact, God can only be for us as He is in us, as it is not only He but we. Unless the Cross of Christ was man's death with God from sin, it was not God's death for man because of sin.

W. P. DU BOSE.

*University of the South, Sewanee.*

#### BRIEF REVIEWS AND NOTES.

Sabbath-school teachers will find it to their advantage, when following the Apostolic history, to take in hand an *Introduction to the Study of the Acts of the Apos-*

*les*, by Dr. J. M. Stifler, Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Crozer Theological Seminary. The book is not a commentary, but it may be read with profit in connection with the text and its exposition. The author says that his guiding purpose throughout has been to answer the question, "Why was this said?" The book is attractive inside and out. (New York: Revell Co. 75 cents net.)

*Inebriety: its Source, Prevention and Cure*, is not exactly a medical book, but it is one with an excellent object. The author is Charles Follen Palmer, but there is no indication of his personality or position. The work is a statement of the case of the inebriate and an account of the steps for his reclamation. It is particularly valuable for its psychological examination of the morbid conditions induced by excess, and for the hints which it gives as to proper methods of treatment. (New York: Revell Co. 50 cents.)

## SUBJECT INDEX TO THEOLOGICAL PERIODICALS.

### ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS RECORD.

At. M. E. R.	African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)	Luth. Q.	Lutheran Quarterly.
Am. Cath. Q. R.	American Catholic Quarterly Review.	Meth. R.	Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)
Am. J. T.	American Journal of Theology.	Meth. R. So.	Methodist Review, South. (Quarterly.)
Bib. Sac.	Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)	Miss. H.	Missionary Herald.
Bib. W.	Biblical World.	Miss. R.	Missionary Review.
Can. M. R.	Canadian Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)	New W.	The New World. (Quarterly.)
Chr. L.	Christian Literature.	Pre. M.	Preacher's Magazine.
Chr. Q.	Christian Quarterly.	Presb. Q.	Presbyterian Quarterly.
Church Q. R.	Church Quarterly Review.	Presb. Ref. R.	Presbyterian and Reformed Review. (Quarterly.)
Ex.	Expositor.	Prot. Ep. R.	Protestant Epis. Review.
Ex. T.	Expository Times.	Ref. C. R.	Reformed Church Review. (Quarterly.)
Hom. R.	Homiletic Review.	Treas.	The Treasury.
Luth. C. R.	Lutheran Church Review.	Yale R.	The Yale Review. (Quarterly.)

Unless otherwise specified, all references are to the February number of periodicals.

**Arphaxad**, Professor Hommel on. (T. K. Cheyne) Ex.

**Atonement**, Elements of the doctrine of the, in the facts of our Lord's sufferings. (J. S. Candlish) Bib. W.

**Authority** in religion, Protestants and the principle of. (F. W. Grey) Am. Cath. Q. R. (Jan.).

- Bible**, Our, and our faith. (J. R. Van Pelt) Meth.R.  
**By** hook or by crook. (H. Macmillan) Ex.T.  
**Chippewas** and Ottawas: Father Baraga's books in their language. (R. R. Elliott) Am.Cath.Q.R. (Jan.).  
**Christ**, Homelessness of. Ex.T.  
**Christ** of all days. (E. H. Dells) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Christian** perfection. (J. A. Beet) Ex.  
**Christianity**, Primitive error of. (C. W. Votaw) Bib.W.  
**Christianity**, Social, in England. (C. Zueblin) Meth.R.  
**Christianity** and the modern city. (W. J. Tucker) Treas.  
**Christ's** attitude to His own death. (A. M. Fairbairn) Ex.  
**Christ's** glorified humanity and the Lord's Supper. (S. L. Keyser) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Church** and state. (R. J. M.) Am.Cath.Q.R. (Jan.).  
**Church** and the sociological movement. (G. Taylor) Treas.  
**Cleavage**, Line of. (G. W. Wenner) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Clergy** and the social problem. (G. Tyrrell) Am.Cath.Q.R. (Jan.).  
**Common** sense, Protest of, against some common nonsense. (V. D. Rossman) Am.Cath.Q.R. (Jan.).  
**Communion** of saints. (L. A. Fox) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Conscience**, Objective. (M. H. Richards) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Cornwallis**, Lord, Surrender of. (R. C. Winthrop) Treas.  
**Education**, Classical languages in. (J. H. Stough) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Education**, Ministerial. (C. Lockhart) Chr.Q. (Jan.).  
**England**, Social Christianity in. (C. Zueblin) Meth.R.  
**Entertainments**, church, Question of. (H. M. Clarke) Prot.Ep.R.  
**Faith**, Our Bible and our. (J. R. Van Pelt) Meth.R.  
**Faith** and doubt. (W. E. Barton) Treas.  
**Germany**, Theological thought in. (G. H. Schodde) Treas.  
**Gideon**, Story of. (M. G. Pearse) Pre.M.  
**Grace** without measure. (W. B. Waller) Treas.  
**Greece**, Attitudes of worship in. (A. Fairbanks) Bib.W.  
**Hatch's** (Dr.) "Essays in Biblical Greek," Criticism of, by Dr. Hort. Ex.  
**Hawkins**, Rev. Elijah, Sketch of. (J. A. Brown) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Holy** Spirit as energizing the sacraments. (T. A. Tidball) Prot.Ep.R.  
**Hunt**, Sandford. (A. B. Sandford) Meth.R.  
**Hypothetics**. (E. R. Hull) Am.Cath.Q.R. (Jan.).  
**Judaism**, Latin pagan side-lights on. (E. Post) Meth.R.  
**Languages**, Classical, in education. (J. H. Stough) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Lavigerie**, Cardinal. (W. C. Robinson) Am.Cath.Q.R. (Jan.).  
**Law** filled full. (T. Munnell) Chr.Q. (Jan.).  
**"Liberty** of the Tree of Life." (G. Matheson) Ex.  
**Lord's** Supper, Christ's glorified humanity and the. (S. L. Keyser) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Louis**, Saint, Glance at the reign of. (R. Parsons) Am.Cath.Q.R. (Jan.).  
**Luke**, Saint, in the International Critical Commentary. (H. A. Redpath) Ex.T.  
**McCosh**, James: president, philosopher, preacher. (C. E. Grammer) Prot.Ep.R.  
**McKendree**, William, the ecclesiastical statesman. (W. P. Lovejoy) Meth.R.So.



- Melanchthon**, Philip. (W. Kelly) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Methodism**, Earliest western schools of. (G. Alexander) Meth.R.So.  
**Methodism** and the young people. (R. N. Sledd) Meth.R.So.  
**Methodisms** in the south, 'Two Episcopal. (J. T. Daves, Jr.) Meth.R.So.  
**Ministerial education**. (C. Lockhart) Chr.Q. (Jan.).  
**Ministers** and church-members. (J. C. Havemeyer) Pre.M.  
**Miracles** of the Bible (J. Stevens) Meth.R.  
**Morals**, Basis of. (G. G. Findlay) Ex.T.  
**Moses** at the battle of Rephidim. (G. Margoliouth) Ex.  
**Munsey**, William Elbert. (E. E. Hoss) Meth.R.So.  
**Newman**, Cardinal—poet and reformer. (H. B. Munson) Meth.R.  
**Non-Christian** faiths, What we owe the. (W. F. Oldham) Meth.R.  
**Packard, J.**: Recollections of a long life. Prot.Ep.R.  
**Palestine**, Modes of travel in. (W. Briggs) Treas.  
**Parable** of the sower. (A. H. Walker) Pre.M.  
**Pastor** at work in the Sunday-school. (H. B. MacCauley) Treas.  
**Perfection**, Christian. (J. A. Beet) Ex.  
**Pessimism**, Aspects of. (J. Kendal) Am.Cath.Q.R. (Jan.).  
**Pierce Lovick**. (W. Lewis) Meth.R.So.  
**Poetry** and the spiritual life. (E. Mims) Meth.R.So.  
**Preaching**, Apprenticeship of. (W. L. Watkinson) Meth.R.  
**Protestants** and the principle of authority in religion. (F. W. Grey) Am.Cath.Q.R. (Jan.).  
**Psalm** ci. (K. Budde) Ex.T.  
**Religious teaching**, Value of scientific knowledge in. (H. M. DuBose) Meth.R.So.  
**Rephidim**, battle of, Moses at the. (G. Maroliouth) Ex.  
**Reunion** question. (W. T. Moore) Chr.Q. (Jan.).  
**Revelation**, Rocks and. (O. Scott) Bib.W.  
**Revelation** ii. 7. (G. Matheson) Ex.  
**Rocks** and revelation (O. Scott) Bib.W.  
**Ruskin**, John, as a political economist. (W. J. Lhamon) Chr.Q. (Jan.).  
**Sacraments**, Holy Spirit as energizing the. (T. A. Tidball) Prot.Ep.R.  
**Saints**, Communion of. (L. A. Fox) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Saviour's tomb**. (W. R. Turner) Meth.R.  
**Scientific spirit**. (A. M. Muckenfuss) Meth.R.So.  
**Scientific knowledge**, Value of, in religious teaching. (H. M. DuBose) Meth.R.So.  
**Scriptural numbers**, Meaning of. (J. H. Rockwell) Am.Cath.Q.R. (Jan.).  
**Social problem**, Clergy and the. (G. Tyrrell) Am.Cath.Q.R. (Jan.).  
**Sociological** movement, What the Church may expect from the present. (G. Taylor) Treas.  
**Sower**, Parable of the. (A. H. Walker) Pre.M.  
**Sunday-school**, Pastor at work in the. (H. B. MacCauley) Treas.  
**Teacher's mission**. (H. W. Everest) Chr.Q. (Jan.).  
**Temptation** and the agony. (J. E. Godbey) Meth.R.So.  
**Threefold cord**. (W. R. Inge) Ex.  
**Theological** thought in Germany. (G. H. Schodde) Treas.  
**Truth**, Pillar of the. (E. T. Horn) Luth.Q. (Jan.).  
**Washington**, Religious character of. (W. S. Perry) Treas.  
**Worship** in Greece, Attitudes of. (A. Fairbanks) Bib.W.

## CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

**American Catholic Quarterly Review.**

Philadelphia, January, 1897.  
 Cardinal Lavigerie.  
 Chippewas and Ottawas: Father Baraga's books in their language.  
 Glance at the reign of St. Louis.  
 Aspects of pessimism.  
 Church and state.  
 Hypotheses.  
 Protestants and the principle of authority in religion.  
 Clergy and the social problem.  
 Protest of common sense against some common nonsense.  
 Meaning of scriptural numbers.

**Biblical World.**

Chicago, February, 1897.  
 Elements of the doctrine of the atonement in the facts of our Lord's sufferings.  
 Attitudes of worship in Greece.  
 Rocks and revelation.  
 Primitive era of Christianity.

**Christian Literature.**

New York, February, 1897.  
 Ritschlian reform movement in Germany and Sweden.  
 Basis of morals.  
 Recent discoveries in Babylonia.  
 Papal bull.  
 Theology of Walter Pater.  
 Metropolitan church.  
 Church in America.  
 Ian Maclaren's creed and what some clergymen think of it.  
 Shrewd schemes for proselyting American Christianity.

**The Expositor.**

London, February, 1897.  
 Criticism of Dr. Hatch's "Essays in biblical Greek" by Dr. Hort.  
 Liberty of the tree of life.  
 Christ's attitude to His own death.

Moses at the battle of Rephidim.  
 Threefold cord.  
 Christian perfection  
 Professor Hommel on Arphaxad.

**Expository Times.**

Edinburgh, February, 1897.

Psalm ci.  
 Basis of morals.  
 By hook or by crook.  
 St. Luke in the International Critical Commentary.  
 Homelessness of Christ.

**The Lutheran Quarterly.**

Gettysburg, January, 1897.

Communion of saints.  
 Philip Melancthon.  
 Classical languages in education.  
 Line of cleavage.  
 Christ's glorified humanity and the Lord's Supper.  
 Objective conscience.  
 Pillar of the truth.  
 Christ of all days.  
 Sketch of Rev. Elijah Hawkins.

**Methodist Review.**

New York, Jan.-Feb., 1897.

Sandford Hunt.  
 What we owe the non-Christian faiths.  
 Apprenticeship of preaching.  
 John Henry, Cardinal Newman, poet and reformer.  
 Social Christianity in England.  
 Miracles of the Bible.  
 Latin pagan side lights on Judaism.  
 Saviour's tomb.  
 Our Bible and our faith.

**The Methodist Review.**

Nashville, Jan.-Feb., 1897.

Lovick Pierce.  
 Value of scientific knowledge in religious teaching.

Scientific spirit.  
 William Elbert Munsey.  
 Earliest western schools of Methodism.  
 William McKendree, the ecclesiastical statesman.  
 Poetry and the spiritual life.  
 Two Episcopal Methodisms in the south.  
 Temptation and the agony.  
 Methodism and the young people.

### **The Christian Quarterly.**

Columbia, Mo., January, 1897.

Reunion question.  
 Teacher's mission.  
 Law filled full.  
 Ministerial education.  
 John Ruskin as a political economist.

### **Preacher's Magazine.**

New York, February, 1897.

Enthusiasm of God's kingdom.  
 Story of Gideon.  
 Parable of the sower.  
 Ministers and church-members.  
 Homiletics.

### **Protestant Episcopal Review.**

Theological Seminary, Va., February, 1897.

Holy Spirit as energizing the sacraments.  
 Recollections of a long life.  
 Question of church entertainments.  
 James McCosh; president, philosopher, preacher.

### **The Treasury.**

New York, February, 1897.

Religious character of Washington.  
 Surrender of Lord Cornwallis.  
 Grace without measure.

Faith and doubt.  
 Christianity and the modern city.  
 What the Church may expect from the present sociological movement.  
 Modes of travel in Palestine.  
 Theological thought in Germany.  
 Pastor at work in the Sunday-school.

## **MAGAZINES.**

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for March contains: "Mr. Cleveland as President," Woodrow Wilson; "My Sixty Days in Greece," Basil L. Gildersleeve; "The Charm," Frank Dempster Sherman; "Marigold-Michel," Blanche Willis Howard; "Venus in the Light of Recent Discoveries," Percival Lowell; "Cheerful Yesterdays," Thomas Wentworth Higginson; "The Rational Study of the Classics," Irving Babbitt; "Legislative Shortcomings," Francis C. Lowell; "The Good and the Evil of Industrial Combination," Arthur Twining Hadley; "The Juggler," Charles Egbert Craddock; "The Arbitration Treaty," John Fiske; "The Story of an Untold Love," Paul Leicester Ford.

THE contents of the CENTURY for March are: "Our Fellow-Citizen of the White House," Clarence Clough Buel; "Hugh Wynne, Free Quaker," S. Weir Mitchell; "The Nation's Library," A. R. Spofford; "The Decorations in the New Congressional Library," William A. Coffin; "Campaigning with Grant," Horace Porter; "The Man who Worked with Collister," Mary Tracy Earle; "Inauguration Scenes and Incidents," Joseph B. Bishop; "Nelson at Trafalgar," Alfred T. Mahan; "Our Witch," Richard Malcolm John-

ston; "The Art of Large Giving," George Iles; "Flower before the Leaf," G. E. Woodberry; "Some Writers of Good Letters," Royal Cortissoz.

THE contents of HARPER'S MAGAZINE for March are: "Love and Death" (a poem), Howard Pyle; "The Awakening of a Nation," Charles F. Lummis; "Separ's Vigilante" (a story), Owen Wister; "Astronomical Progress of the Century," Henry Smith Williams, M.D.; "Perdita" (a story), Hildegard Hawthorne; "The Unreturning" (a poem), Margaret E. Sangster; "Mr. Henry G. Marquand," E. A. Alexander; "La Gommeuse" (a story), Charles Belmont Davis; "Preparedness for Naval War," Captain A. T. Mahan, U.S.N.; "The Martian" (a novel, Part VI.), George Du Maurier; "Decadence of the New England Deep-Sea Fisheries," Joseph William Collins; "White Man's Africa" (Part V., The Last of a Great Black Nation), Poultney Bigelow; "Editor's Study," Charles Dudley Warner; "Monthly Record of Current Events," "Editor's Drawer," "Literary Notes," Laurence Hutton.

THE contents of LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE for March are: "Dead Selves," Julia Magruder; "Farming under Glass," George Ethelbert Walsh; "Origin of Pennsylvanian Surnames," L. Oscar Kuhns; "Father Sebastian," Kate Jordan; "The Deserts of Southeast California," John E. Bennett; "Sue's Weddin'," Minna C. Hale; "In the Manuscript Room of the British Museum," D. C. Macdonald; "Innocuous Vanity," Ellen Duval; "The Phantom Kangaroo," Owen Hall; "A Dilemma of the Day," Helen F. Lovett; "The Contributor his Own Editor," Frederic M. Bird.

McCLURE'S MAGAZINE for March contains: "Telegraphing without Wires," H. J. W. Dam; "St. Ives," Robert Louis Stevenson; "Grant's Quiet Years at Northern Posts," Hamlin Garland; "Daniel Vierge, the Master Illustrator," August F. Jaccaci; "Captains Courageous," Rudyard Kipling; "The Lady in the Box," Clinton Ross; "A Night with Stanton in the War Office," General John M. Thayer; "Huerfano Bill, the Bandit," Cy Warman; "The Laureate of the Larger England," W. D. Howells; "A Note on Skipper Ireson," Captain John Codman; "An Unpublished Portrait of Franklin," Charles Henry Hart; "Life on a Greenland Whaler," A. Conan Doyle.

MARCH SCRIBNER'S contains: "The Banderium of Hungary," Richard Harding Davis; "The Master of the Lithograph—J. McNeill Whistler," Elizabeth Robins Pennell; "The Story of a Play," W. D. Howells; "The Business of a Factory," Philip G. Hurbert, Jr.; "Soldiers of Fortune," Richard Harding Davis; "The Art of Travel," Lewis Morris Iddings; "London: as Seen by C. D. Gibson;" "Liver's Responsibility," Wolcott Le Clear Beard.

## LITERARY NOTES.

THE publishers of the late C. H. Spurgeon's sermons, Messrs. Passmore & Alabaster, have just received an order for 1,000,000 (one million) from the Spurgeon Memorial Sermon Society, 72 The Drive, Brighton, formed for the making free grants of the sermons for distribution as loan tracts. The weekly publication of these sermons has continued without a break for forty-one years, and over 2500 different sermons are now in

circulation, while there are sufficient unpublished manuscripts in hand to continue the issue weekly for some years. The total number already issued in this country must be considerably over 100,000,000, and they are still as popular as ever. The sermons have been translated into almost every known language, and have an immense sale in America and the colonies.

ACKNOWLEDGING the receipt of a copy of "Armenia and Europe: An Indictment by Dr. J. Lepsius," edited by J. Rendel Harris, M.A., Mr. Gladstone writes to the publishers, Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton:

DEAR SIRS: I thank you for the work of Dr. Lepsius on Armenia. And I attach to it a great value on account of its high tone and plainness of speech. And, further, because it bears on behalf of his country to that terrible state of things which collective Europe to its own infinite dishonor has endured for the last two years with such a guilty and shameful tolerance. For that tolerance I fear that Germany is, along with Russia, principally responsible.

Yours very faithfully,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

January 22, 1897.

THE American Sunday-School Union offers two prizes, of \$600 and \$400 respectively, for books on "Forming and Maintaining Character on Bible Principles." The widest practicable freedom will be allowed in the form and style of treatment, which may be didactic, descriptive, narrative, or in story form. The works submitted must contain not less than 50,000, nor more than 100,000 words, and must be submitted on or before October 1st, 1897. The prizes are offered in accordance

with the terms and conditions of the John C. Green Income Fund.

THE Open Court Publishing Company are issuing simultaneously in London and Chicago a translation of Gustav Freytag's "Martin Luther," with twenty-six illustrations. The work is more than a biography of the great reformer. It is a powerful philosophical sketch of Luther's import and mission in the mighty, irresistible development of universal history; an appreciation of the man without equal in literature. It will also be found to afford a charming picture of the social and intellectual life of the sixteenth century. The illustrations are taken from famous paintings or engravings.

AN important feature of forthcoming numbers of *The Outlook* will be articles on the new Congressional Library at Washington, the new Public Library of Chicago, and the new Consolidated Library of New York. The first has been written by Mr. F. Hopkinson Smith, the famous artist and story-teller, who has also painted four pictures of the new Congressional Library for *The Outlook*. The other articles will be written respectively by Rabbi Emil Hirsch, of the Chicago University, and by Dr. John S. Billings, who is to be president of the Greater New York Library. (\$3.00 a year. The Outlook Company, 13 Astor Place, New York.)

NOTWITHSTANDING precarious health and the pressure of regular duties, Canon Knox Little has (says the *Bookman*) nearly got ready for the press the concluding chapters of his new work, "St. Francis of Assisi, his Times, Life, and Work." Isbister & Co., who are the publishers, expect to issue the work early in the spring.

A VOLUME on Second Corinthians has just been added to the Rev. J. S. Exell's Biblical Illustrator Series. The publishers, the Fleming H. Revell Company, to whom the series was recently transferred from the late firm of Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., an-

nounce that the three concluding volumes of the New Testament section of the series will be issued during the first six months of this year, namely, First and Second Peter; First, Second, and Third John; and Jude and Revelation.

## CHRONICLE, OBITUARY, AND CALENDAR.

COMPILED BY PROFESSOR GEORGE W. GILMORE, A.M.

### CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 10th.)

Dec. 11-12.—First Annual Meeting of the Council of Seventy of the *American Institute of Sacred Literature*, Chicago.

Jan. 11.—Annual Meeting of the *American Sabbath Union*.

Jan. 12.—Meeting of the *Board of Managers of* (Protestant Episcopal) *Missions*, in New York City.

Jan. 13.—Fifth Conference of the *Representatives of Foreign Mission Boards* of the United States and Canada, in New York City.

Jan. 19-21.—Conference of the *International Field Workers' Association*, in Louisville, Ky.

Jan. 20.—Annual Convention of the *King's Daughters and Sons*, in New York City.

Jan. 22.—Twenty-ninth Annual Meeting of the *Evangelical Alliance for the United States*, in New York City.

Jan. 26.—Thirtieth Anniversary of *Bishop Neely's* Consecration over the diocese of *Maine*.

Jan. 26-28.—English National *Sunday School Convention*, in Manchester.

Jan. 28.—Day of Prayer for Schools and Colleges.

Feb. 9.—Annual Meeting of the *Board of Control* of the *Epworth League*, in New York City.

Feb. 10.—Annual Meeting of the *Methodist Episcopal Book Committee*, in New York City.

### PERSONAL.

*The Rev. Hugh Macmillan, D.D., LL.D.*, is nominated Moderator of the General Assembly of the *Free Church of Scotland*.

*The Rev. Charles A. Berry, D.D.*, has become President

of the *Congregational Union* of England and Wales.

*Dr. Arthur Little*, of Dorchester, succeeds the late Dr. Quint on the *Board of Visitors* of Andover Theological Seminary.

### ROMAN CATHOLIC.

*Dr. Thomas Conaty* was installed *Rector* of the *Catholic University* of America, Washington, D. C., Jan. 19.

*The Rev. Edward J. O'Dea, D.D.*, has been appointed *Bishop* of *Nesqually*, Wash.

*The Rev. Edward P. Allen,*

*D.D.*, has been nominated *Bishop* of *Mobile*, Ala., in succession to the late *Bishop O'Sullivan*.

*Bishop Keane* has been nominated *Bishop Assistant* at the *Pontifical Throne*, and will be stationed at Rome.

### EPISCOPAL.

*Canon Trefusis*, of *Exeter Cathedral*, has been appointed *Bishop* of *Crediton*, *Suffragan Bishop* of *Exeter*.

*The Very Rev. Mervyn Archdall*, *Dean* of *Cork*, has been elected *Bishop* of *Killaloe*, *Ireland*.

*Canon Punchard*, of *Christ Church*, *Luton*, Eng., has declined the *Bishopric* of *An-*

*tigua*, *West Indies*. This is the third bishopric he has declined.

*Dr. Mylne*, *Bishop* of *Bombay*, will soon resign.

*The Rt. Rev. Anson R. Graves*, *Missionary Bishop* of the *Platte*, has been assigned to the *Mission District* of *Northern California* during the disability of *Bishop Wingfield*.

### EDUCATIONAL—COLLEGES.

*Mr. Ottley* will resign the *Principalship* of *Pusey House*, *Oxford*, at the end of the present academical year.

*Principal Robertson*, of *Bishop Hatfield Hall*, has been appointed *Principal* of *King's College*, *London*, to succeed *Dr. Wace*.

*General G. W. C. Lee* has resigned the presidency of *Washington and Lee University*.

*Dr. Eliphalet Knott Potter* has resigned the presidency of *Harvard College*.

*Dr. Willis G. Craig* declines the election to the presidency of *Centre College*, *Ky.*

### THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

*The Rev. Dr. Thomas S. Hastings* has resigned the *presidency* of *Union Theological Seminary*, and the *Rev. Dr. G. L. Prentiss*, the chair of *Pastoral Theology* in the same. *The Rev. Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall* has been nominated as *President*, and will take *Dr. Prentiss'* chair.

*The Rev. Edward Waite Miller* has been installed *Hyde Professor* of *Ecclesiastical History* and *Church Polity* in *Auburn Seminary*.

*The Rev. David Rowlands* has become temporary *Principal* of the *Memorial College* (*English Congregational*), *Brecon*, *England*.

## OBITUARY.

*Adams, Rev. William* (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.* (St. James's College, Md.), at Nashotah House, Wis., Jan. 2, aged 83. Dr. Adams was born in Monaghan, County Ulster, Ireland; he was graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, B.A., 1836, and registered as an elector of the university, 1838; removed to the United States in 1838; graduated from the General Theological Seminary, New York City, 1841; formed with his classmates the plan of the Nashotah Mission, being ordained deacon the same year, 1841; went to Wisconsin, investigated the Nashotah grounds, and was ordained priest, 1842; the next year, having spent the intervening time in settling and initiating the mission, he returned East; returned to Nashotah to teach, 1844; married the only daughter of Bishop Kemper in 1843; along with his professorship of Systematic Divinity, he had the care of several churches, notably those of Delafield and Pine Lake in 1878 to 1886; resigned and was made professor emeritus, 1893. He was a frequent contributor to the papers of his denomination, and besides published several books, "The Elements of Christian Science," "A Treatise on Regeneration in Baptism," etc. His associates in the Nashotah House were James Lloyd Breck and John Henry Hobart.

*Duryee, Rev. William Rankin* (Dutch Reformed), *D.D.* (Rutgers College, 1877), in New Brunswick, N. J., Jan. 20, aged 58. Dr. Duryee was born in Newark, N. J.; he was graduated from Rutgers College, 1856; studied law a year; en-

tered the New Brunswick Theological Seminary, 1857; spent a year in travel, and then graduated from the seminary, 1861; became chaplain of the First Kentucky Infantry, but resigned through ill-health, 1863; took charge of a mission in East Williamsburgh, L. I., the same year, but removed to the care of the Lafayette Reformed Church, Brooklyn, 1864; here he served for twenty-seven years, resigning only to accept the chair of Ethics and Christian Evidences in Rutgers College, 1891; he had previously declined the chair of History and Political Economy in the same institution. He was president of the General Synod, in 1883; his influence was very great in the "Race Track Campaign" in New Jersey some years ago. He was quite well known as a writer of hymns, and as a contributor to religious papers.

*Evans, Rev. Williams* (Welsh Congregationalist), at Aberaeron, Wales, Dec. 22, aged 87. Mr. Evans, who was known as the "unmitred bishop of Cardiganshire," was born in Talybont, Wales; he commenced to preach at the age of twenty; entered the theological school at Neuaddlwyd under the care of the noted Dr. Thomas Phillips; graduated and became co-pastor under his instructor, 1835; upon the death of Dr. Phillips, he became sole pastor, and retained this position for sixty-one years; in 1891 he was given a co-pastor in the person of the Rev. T. Gwilym Evans. The subject of this sketch preached the Union sermon of the Welsh Independents in 1874, and was the chairman



of the Welsh Congregational Union, 1877. His jubilee was celebrated in 1885.

*Evans, Rev. Herber* (Welsh Congregationalist), *D.D.*, at Bangor, Wales, Dec. 30, aged 61. Dr. Evans was born in Pant-yronen, Wales; he was educated at the public schools, and then apprenticed to a draper; removing to Liverpool, he formed a friendship with the Rev. Dr. John Thomas, who induced him to think of the ministry; he entered Brecon College, 1858, and the next year was called to the Tabernacle, Morriston; this offer he declined, refusing to break his college course; the church decided to wait for him, and on his graduation he became its pastor, 1862; he became pastor at Salem, Carnarvon, 1865; remained there till 1893, when he became president of North Wales College. Dr. Evans was regarded as the foremost Welsh preacher of his times. He was president of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, in 1892; he was also a writer of hymns and Welsh poetry.

*Hitchens, Rev. J. Hiles* (English Congregationalist), *D.D.*, in London, Dec. 21, aged 61. He was educated privately, and beginning to preach when only sixteen, was induced to enter Western College, Plymouth; he was made pastor of the church at Peckham Rye, 1853; the work of preaching in theatres was just then opening, and Dr. Hitchens accepted the opportunities, preaching in nearly every theatre in London; he was called to Luton, and accepted in 1866; there he identified himself with the progress of the place; his last charge, that of the Eccleston Square Church, was assumed in 1871,

ending only with his death in the arms of his son, his co-pastor. Dr. Hitchens was a prolific writer, and has left a number of books behind.

*Horr, Rev. George E.* (Baptist), in Bayonne, N. J., Jan. 26, aged 68. He was graduated from Brown University; his pastorates are as follows: Chicopee, Mass., 1857-62; North Orange, N. J., 1862-66; Bristol, Conn., 1866-68; North Church, Newark, N. J., 1868-71; Roseville Church, 1871-77; Main Street, Worcester, Mass., 1877-82; Charles River Church, Cambridge, Mass., 1882-83; Somerville, N. J., 1883-86; Summit, N. J., 1886-92; and Bayonne, N. J., 1892, until his death. He was closely identified with the educational work of his church.

*Jewett, Rev. Lyman* (Baptist), *D.D.*, in Fitchburg, Mass., Jan. 7, aged 83. He was born in Waterford, Me.; received his education at Brown University and Newton Theological Institution; supplied the church in Webster, Mass., for some time; was appointed by the Missionary Union to the Telugu field, and sailed for his work, 1848; his service was almost continuous up to 1885, when he retired; he made journeys home for rest in 1861 and 1874; the Sepoy rebellion necessitated the suspension of work for a few months in 1857; during his rest in 1861, the Board proposed to abandon the Telugu Mission, but his representations prevented the decision being made. The result was the noted Telugu awakening.

*Jones, Rt. Rev. William Basil* (Anglican), *D.D.* (University of Oxford, 1874), at Carmarthen, Wales, Jan. 14, aged 75. Bish-

op Jones was born at Cheltenham; prepared for college at Shrewsbury School; was scholar of Trinity College, Oxford, 1840, and Ireland scholar, 1842; was graduated, B.A., 1844, and M.A., 1847; was ordained deacon, 1848, and priest, 1853; was Michel Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, 1848-51, and fellow of University College, 1851-57; master of the schools, 1848; tutor in University College, 1854-65; classical moderator, 1856 and 1860; select preacher at Oxford, 1860-62, 1866-67, 1876-78, and at Cambridge, 1881; was senior proctor at Oxford, 1861-62; examining chaplain to the Archbishop of York, 1861-74; public examiner in theology, 1870; prebendary of St. David's Cathedral, 1859-65; prebendary of Grindal in York Cathedral, 1863-71; perpetual curate of Haxby, Yorkshire, 1863-65; vicar of Bishopthorpe and Middlethorpe, 1865-74; archdeacon of York, 1867-74; rural dean of Bishopthorpe, 1869-74; and of the city of York, 1873-74, chancellor of York Cathedral and prebendary of Laughton-en-le-Morthen, 1871-74; canon residentiary of York, 1873-74; consecrated bishop of St. David's, 1874; a suffragan, bishop of Swansea, was given him, 1890. He had been a prolific writer on Welsh antiquities, ecclesiastical antiquities, the classics, theology, etc., and made the commentary on Luke in the Speaker's Commentary.

*McIlvaine, Rev. Joshua Hall* (Presbyterian), *D.D.* (Rochester University, 1854), in Princeton, N. J., Jan. 30, aged 81. He was born in Lewes, Del.; was graduated from the College of New Jersey, 1837, and Princeton Theological Semi-

nary, 1840; served as stated supply at Freehold, N. J., and for the First Church, Paterson, N. J.; was ordained, 1842; called to Little Falls, N. Y., 1841; to the Westminster Church, Utica, N. Y., 1843; became pastor of the First Church, Rochester, 1848; professor of Belles Lettres at Princeton, 1860; re entered the pastorate with the High Street Church, Newark, N. J., 1870; became president of Evelyn College, Princeton, N. J., 1888, which position he held at his death. Among his writings are "The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil," "Elocution, the Sources and Elements of its Power," "The Wisdom of Holy Scripture with Reference to Scriptural Objections," "The Wisdom of the Apocalypse," etc. He was known as having a keen interest in philology and science; was the first American to explain the methods by which Rawlinson deciphered the Persian cuneiform; was a fellow of the American Oriental Society, and a scholar in Sanskrit.

*Rankine, Rev. James* (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.* (Hobart College, 1863), *LL.D.* (Union College, 1895), at Geneva, N. Y., Dec. 16, aged 69. He was born in Ayrshire, Scotland; his parents emigrated with him in 1835; he was graduated at Union College, 1846; began his studies for orders under Dr. (now Bishop) Williams at Schenectady; his teacher was called to the presidency of Trinity College, and Mr. Rankine went along as assistant professor of mathematics; he was ordained deacon, 1850, and took charge of the present Grace Church, Old Windsor; was called as rector of St. Paul's Church,

Owego, N. Y., 1853; took charge of the Theological School at Geneva, now known as De Lancey Divinity School, and he held this position at his death. For two years Dr. Rankine had the additional labor of the presidency of Hobart College, under which he broke down, but a trip to Europe restored him. He has been prominent in the councils of his denomination, delegate to the General Convention, member of the ecclesiastical court of the diocese, etc.

*Scott, Rev. John P.* (Presbyterian), *D.D.*, at Monticello, N. Y., Jan. 8, aged 67. He was born near Scottsville, Pa.; his education was begun at Duquesne College, Pittsburg, and his graduation was from Jefferson College, 1850; he took his theological course at Canonsburg, Pa., 1850-53; supplied churches in Baltimore and Philadelphia, and then became principal of the Jefferson Institute; went to the pastorate of the Second Avenue Presbyterian Church, Detroit, 1859; while there he edited the *Detroit Pulpit*, founded the Workingwomen's Home, etc.; accepted call to Monticello, N. Y., 1878; went from there to Lebanon, O., 1882, where he was laboring at the time of his death.

*Stubbs, Rev. John William* (Anglican), *D.D.*, in Dublin, Jan. 10, aged 72. He was a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, 1840; was elected fellow of his college, 1845; became senior fellow, 1882; was Bursar for eleven years; was appointed Senior Catechist, 1896. His connection as a worker with his college covered over fifty years. He was a mathematician of

power, and of great aid to his church and his college as a financier.

*Tregaro, Rt. Rev. Mgr. François Marie* (Roman Catholic), at Seez, France, Jan. 6, aged 72. The late prelate was a Breton, born at Peillac in 1824; he was made priest, 1848; was made naval chaplain on the French fleet, and saw much service abroad, passing through the Crimean and Chinese campaigns; he received the cross of the Legion of Honor, 1855, and was made an officer of the order, 1860; he retired from the naval service, 1873, and went to Vannes as Vicar-general; was named coadjutor to the bishop of Seez, 1881, and succeeded to the office the next year. The deceased bishop was an ardent defender of the Church; he combatted the "anti-religious" decrees of 1880, and his conduct here was condemned by the Council of State.

*Barnhart, Rev. John W.* (Methodist Episcopal), at Tarrytown, N. Y., aged 63.

*Benson, Rev. H. C.* (Methodist Episcopal), at Santa Clara, Cal., Jan. 14, aged 81.

*Borah, Rev. J. T.* (Presbyterian), at Rienzi, Miss., Jan. 12, aged 76.

*Brown, Rev. Theodore Sedgwick* (Reformed, Dutch), in Albany, N. Y., Jan. 14, aged 72.

*Caldwell, Rev. James* (Presbyterian), at Decker's Point, Pa., Jan. 8, aged 72.

*Closson, Rev. Harrison* (Universalist), at Manchester, N. Y., Jan. 23, aged 68.

*Crofford, Rev. William H.* (Cumberland Presbyterian),

- near Saulsbury, Tenn., Jan. 16, aged 85.
- Fisher, Rev. C. O.* (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, at Oxford, Ga., Jan. 6.
- Hay, Rev. W.* (Canadian Congregational), at Scotland, Ont., Jan. 16, aged 75.
- Holliday, Rev. S. H.* (Presbyterian), at Allegheny, Pa., Jan. 11, aged 64.
- Hooper, Rev. Thomas* (Anglican), at Heyshot Rectory, Eng., Jan. 11, aged 92.
- Howard, Rev. Rodney H.* (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, at Oakdale, Mass., Jan. 3.
- Lanius, Rev. Charles C.* (Moravian), at Nazareth, Pa., Jan. 23, aged 48.
- Lockwood, Rev. M. C.* (Reformed Presbyterian), *D.D.*, in Baltimore, Md., Jan. 8.
- Loughran, Rev. Joshua* (Presbyterian), at White Lake, S. D., Jan. 8, aged 85.
- McKnight, Rev. James C.* (Presbyterian), at Chetopa, Kans., Jan. 15, aged 70.
- Marshall, Rev. W. K.* (Presbyterian), *D.D.*, in Marshall, Tex., Jan. 6, aged 89.
- Oehler, Rev. Gottfried Freder- ick* (Moravian), at West Salem, Ill., Jan. 4, aged 79.
- Olds, Rev. Abner De Forest* (Congregationalist), at Cleveland, O., Jan. 23, aged 82.
- O'Neill, Rev. James* (Anglican), Vicar and Rural Dean of Luton, at Luton, Eng., Dec. 28, aged 76.
- Reid, Rev. John* (Presbyterian), at Warsaw, N. Y., Jan. 2, aged 77.
- Sheridan, Rev. John* (City Missionary in Brooklyn, N. Y.), in Brooklyn, Jan. 18, aged 72.
- Sloan, Rev. D. H.* (Presbyterian), *D.D.*, at Blairsville, Pa., Jan. 17, aged 61.
- Stroh, Rev. N. J.* (Lutheran), at Mt. Morris, Ill., Jan. 2, aged 98. Mr. Stroh was probably the oldest Lutheran minister in the United States. He entered the ministry in 1823.
- Waugh, Rev. George* (Methodist Episcopal), a noted abolitionist, in Roxbury, Mass., Jan. 9.
- Whitham, Rev. John Dewent* (United Presbyterian), at Olympia, Wash., Jan. 14, aged 81.
- Woolmer, Rev. Theophilus* (English Wesleyan Methodist), at Worthing, England, Dec. 27, aged 81.

#### CALENDAR.

[The compiler will welcome notices of meetings of general importance and interest, provided such notices reach him before the 10th of the month prior to that in which the meetings are to take place. Exact dates and names of places, when and where the meetings are to be held, are desired.]

March 8-12.—Metropolitan Council of the *Evangelical Free Churches of England*, in Rochester.

Mar. 26.—Birthday of *Neal Dow*, proposed as *International Prohibition Day*.

## Christian Literature

*A Monthly Review of  
Religious Thought and Movement*

30 Cents a Number      \$3.00 a Year

*Advertising Rates on Application  
Address all Communications to*

**The Christian Literature Co.**

**NEW YORK**

MARCH, 1897.

### The New Cafe St. Denis.

IT ADJOINS THE HOTEL, AND IS A  
WELL-APPOINTED RESORT.

THE architect of to-day is not simply a draughtsman, he is an artist. A pretty good proof of this can now be seen in the striking transformation that has recently taken place in an old building on Broadway, directly opposite Grace Church. What was formerly a homely structure of brick and mortar has blossomed into an object of beauty and an ornament to the great thoroughfare. It adjoins the well-known St. Denis Hotel, and has become a part of that property and a necessary complement to its growing business.

Here the army of diners who patronize the St. Denis will find all the essentials for good eating—perfect service, luxurious appointments, and the best cooking. The entire lower floor is occupied by a commodious lunch counter, affording the quickest possible service; the second floor is fitted up as a handsome gentlemen's restaurant, and above this are admirably appointed dining-rooms, large and small, and a beautiful banquet hall—all furnishing the choicest accommodations for the

individual, select parties, or elaborate dinners. The St. Denis has long been popular with societies, clubs, and college classes, for dinners, meetings, and reunions.

WE do not wish to call especial attention to the advertisement of Pabst Malt Extract, The "Best" Tonic, which appears in this issue, for it is sufficiently conspicuous to make itself apparent. Its presence in this publication is permitted because we have investigated the matter, and find that the preparation is worthy of every confidence.

### HUNTER BICYCLES.

'96 Hunters have Proven a  
Success—What of '97

**F**ACILITIES better than ever. "We lead, others follow" has always been our motto. We found new machinery a necessity to keep up with the most advanced ideas of manufacturing, and consequently it is new machinery we have. Better equipped in many departments than ever, we know the '97 HUNTER will be a decided step in advance.

Special steel, made specially for us, this in combination with our tempering process. Well, well! What a combination they do make!

Our '97 crank fastening is simple, secure, and one of the never-get-out-of-order sort. All the attention it needs is the service of a monkey-wrench. Can be ridden the entire season with little or no attention, and best of all *any one* can keep it in perfect order.

What a boon to any manufacturer to be able to use our Crown Steel Tubing! Just think of it! The entire season shows not a single frame broken! Many say it rings like a bell. Of course it costs

**Equipment**

**Cranks**

**Crank  
Fastenings**

**Frames**

triple the average tubing, but what of that? The HUNTER bicycle is strictly high-grade, and when our patrons place their money with us we see to it that they get value received. Owing to the peculiar construction of the '97 frame, the HUNTER is particularly rigid.

**Bearings** HUNTER bearings are expensive, but they last. We make them all from specially selected stock. We have learned by long experience just how to temper steel, and *always* have it the same. We employ the same process in our bicycle tempering department which has been in use in our gun department for years, and the results have been the most satisfactory. You heard only praise for bearings of the '96 HUNTER, and as the '97 have received the severe test of the hardest kind of service, we know they will prove satisfactory.

**Hubs** Turned direct from the bar—this is done by some of our new machinery. Our '97 hubs are positively dust-proof and almost water-tight. Just examine them before you even think you have the latest.

**Forks and Fork Crowns** Again the record is clean. Not a fork broken, nor a fork crown injured in any way. To be sure, the novice has bent the forks this way and that, but no breaking a fork or crown like the HUNTER. Our patented crown is one of the strong features of the HUNTER, and we call your special attention to it. Beyond all question the HUNTER crown is the strongest ever offered on any bicycle.

**Finish** Our regular color is a beautiful pea-green. Many said it would fade, but it didn't. Many said it was Irish, but it proved to be a seller. Many said too conspicuous; we gave them a beautiful

black striped in gold. You can have your choice. We defy all competition; we have handled enamels for years, and know the business. All say the HUNTER finish is superb.

Forgings of course. We could not afford to use anything but the best in the HUNTER, and here again we give our patrons that, and that only, which years of experience has proven a success. Our advice to you is, "Ride a HUNTER," and thus get what you know is good, and leave the experiments to others.

The '97 HUNTER pedal is light, strong, a fine looker, and decidedly up to date in every detail. We furnish them in rat-trap and rubber. Don't think you have seen the very latest until the opportunity presents itself for you to see the HUNTER pedal.

Steel, finished in the whitest nickel, made from the best stock, hence strong and rigid. We can make them in almost any shape desired.

We have the wood bars made from a specially selected stock. We can furnish them in up-roll, drop, or ram's horn pattern. '97 HUNTER wood bars are choice.

4½ inches—enough said.

Model A—Gents' Roadster,					
22 to 25 pounds, - - -	\$100				
Model B—Ladies' Roadster,					
22 to 26 pounds, - - -	100				
Model C—Gents' Special,					
19 to 21 pounds, - - -	125				
Model D—Ladies' Special,					
20 to 23 pounds, - - -	125				
Tandems,					
32 to 45 pounds, - - -	150				

Write us for our regular illustrated catalogue. We will take good care of you.

THE HUNTER ARMS COMPANY,  
Fulton, N. Y.

Connections

Pedals

Handle Bars Steel

Handle Bars Wood

Tread

Weights and Prices